

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXVI, 2.

WHOLE No. 102.

I.—ECCLESIASTES.

COPYRIGHT, 1905, BY PAUL HAUPT.

The Book of Ecclesiastes¹ is unparalleled in the whole range of Biblical Literature. Ernest Renan spoke of it as the only charming book that was ever written by a Jew. Heinrich Heine called it the Canticles of Skepticism, while Franz Delitzsch thought it was entitled to the name of the Canticles of the Fear of God. From the earliest times down to the present age Ecclesiastes has attracted the attention of thinkers. It was a favorite book of Frederick the Great, who referred to it as a Mirror of Princes. But Biblical students of all ages have experienced some difficulties about this remarkable production. Some in the Jewish Church denied the inspired character of the work, until the synod of Jabneh (90 A. D.) decided in favor of the canonicity of the Book. The genuine portions of Ecclesiastes are out of place in the Canon. Their author is not a theologian, but a man of the world, probably a physician, with keen observation, penetrating insight, and vast experience.²

I believe that the genuine portions of Ecclesiastes were written by a prominent Sadducean physician in Jerusalem, who was born at the beginning of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes (175-164) and died in the first decade of the reign of Alexander Jannæus (104-78 B. C.).³ Ecclesiastes may have been a son of David, just as Jesus and Hillel⁴

were sons of David; he may even have been a king in Jerusalem, if we take *king* to mean *head of a school*.¹ The term *king* is used in this way in the Talmud (Gitt. 62^a; Ber. 64^a). The Book was probably published after the death of the author, who may have worked on it for more than forty years. Nietzsche would have called it *eins der erlebtesten Bücher*. The three or four interpolations² suggesting that this pessimistic poem was a work of the wise king of Israel, Solomon ben-David (about 950 B. C.) may be due to the friends of the author, who edited the book.⁶ On the other hand, there are a great many Pharisaic interpolations directly opposing the Epicurean⁷ teaching set forth in the poem. The genuine portions of Ecclesiastes are Sadducean and Epicurean; Stoic doctrines are found almost exclusively in the Pharisaic interpolations.⁸

Ecclesiastes must have been a Sadducee; for he doubts the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body (3, 21). He must have been a physician; otherwise he could not have given the enumeration of the symptoms of senile decay in the beautiful allegorical description at the end of the Book. He must have been born under the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes (175-164); for in 4, 13-16 he says that he saw the general enthusiasm for the *poor but wise youth* (*i. e.*, Alexander Balas) who succeeded (150 B. C.) to the throne of the *old and foolish king* (*i. e.*, Antiochus Epiphanes).⁹ Ecclesiastes also states, at the end of c. 9, that he saw the successful defense of the small place (Bethsura) against the great king (Antiochus Eupator, 163 B. C.).¹⁰

Schopenhauer¹¹ says that no one can fully appreciate Ecclesiastes until he is seventy, and we may safely assume that Ecclesiastes had reached the age of three score years and ten when he finished his work. If we suppose that he was born in the first year of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, he would have been eight years old at the beginning of the Maccabean rising in 167 B. C., and twelve at the time of the siege of Bethsura in 163 B. C.¹⁰ If he was in Bethsura with his family during the siege, it would not

be surprising that this event made a strong impression on him. At the time of the nuptials of Alexander Balas in 150,⁹ he would have been 25, or 22 at the beginning (153) and 30 at the end (145) of Alexander's meteoric career.

He may have completed his Book at the age of 75, in 100 B. C., but he may not have published it during his lifetime, and his friends and disciples, who desired to make known this remarkable legacy, may have deemed it imprudent to publish it under the name of its author; therefore they tried to make it appear to be a work of King Solomon,⁶ especially as several passages might have been referred to the king then reigning, *viz.*, Alexander Jannæus (104-78 B. C.).¹² The pessimistic poem may have caused such a sensation that it was impossible to suppress it. The Pharisaic authorities therefore decided to save the attractive book for the Congregation but to pour some water into the author's strong wine.¹³ This official recension, which was not castrated but figleaved, may have been prompted by the apocryphal book known as the Wisdom of Solomon,¹⁴ which was composed at Alexandria about 50 B. C. The Wisdom of Solomon (*cf.* especially c. 2) is directed against Ecclesiastes, and the Pharisaic authorities may have deemed it necessary to clear Jerusalem of the suspicion of Epicureanism.⁷ They may have been afraid that the Egyptian Jews might eventually abandon their annual pilgrimages to Jerusalem, preferring to worship at the Temple founded at Leontopolis by Onias IV. about 160 B. C.¹⁵ This Jewish Temple in Egypt existed until 73 A. D., when it was closed by the Romans after the destruction of Jerusalem.

The confusion of the traditional text of Ecclesiastes may be partly accidental, partly intentional.¹⁶ The original manuscript may have been left by the author without a final revision; he may have left a number of parallels and variants¹⁷ without indicating his final preference. This confusion was increased by the editorial changes introduced by the friends of the author, who published the work after his death.⁶ It was further increased by the polemical interpolations of

the orthodox Pharisaic editors, who finally admitted the Book into the Canon of the Sacred Scriptures in 90 A. D. Several of the most objectionable statements are less offensive if preceded¹⁸ or followed¹⁹ by orthodox glosses and scattered through less questionable sections; but combined in their proper order they would have been intolerable.²⁰ For the same reason some of the love-songs in the so-called Song of Solomon seem to have been cut up and dislocated, because in their original order certain erotic allusions would have been too plain and would not have lent themselves to any allegorical interpretation for the purpose of edification.²¹ A dislocated and bandaged arm has no force.²²

We have, of course, no mathematical evidence, and I do not claim to have been present when the editorial changes were made, but my theory explains all the features of this remarkable Book. I came to my conclusions fourteen years ago, after having interpreted the Book in the Old Testament Seminary of the Johns Hopkins University for three years (1888-1891), and when I examined my notes again last winter²³ I found hardly anything requiring modification; in fact, I rediscovered several things which I had found in 1890. My views concerning the Old Testament have undergone considerable modifications during the past fifteen years, ever since I took up the idea of publishing a new edition of the Bible; but with regard to Ecclesiastes my first impression has remained the same in all essential points, although my notes of 1890 had become so unfamiliar to me that I regarded them just as objectively as though they had been compiled by somebody else. Certainly, nothing that has appeared during the past fourteen years, neither the commentary of Wildeboer²⁴ nor the translations of Rüetschi²⁵ and Siegfried,²⁶ have induced me to deviate from my original opinion. The arrangement of the text is practically the same which I made in 1890, a specimen of which was published in the Johns Hopkins University Circulars for June, 1891,²⁷ and reprinted in the *Oriental Studies*² (Boston, 1894).²⁸

I have often stated that I adhere to the maxim that the probably right is preferable to the undoubtedly wrong.²⁹ Instead of prolonging my theoretical discussion of the origin of the Book of Ecclesiastes it will be better to let the great Old Testament pessimist speak for himself. The rhythm of my new English translation has been much improved by the kind assistance of the distinguished co-editor of the Polychrome Bible, Horace Howard Furness. The metrical questions³⁰ will be discussed in an article on the form of the Book of Ecclesiastes, which will be published in the fifth volume of the Johns Hopkins Contributions to Assyriology and Comparative Semitic Grammar (*Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*) edited by Friedrich Delitzsch and Paul Haupt. This will include my critical edition of the Hebrew text which has been in type since July, 1904.

NOTES.

(1) See below, note 1 on section I (p. 34).

(2) See my lecture on the Book of Ecclesiastes in *Oriental Studies* (Boston, Ginn & Co., 1894) pp. 242-278; cf. Siegfried's review in the *Theologische Literatur-Zeitung*, Sept. 28, 1895. Winckler, in his review of Siegfried's commentary on Ecclesiastes, in the *Orientalistische Literatur-Zeitung*, 1, 313-316 (Oct., 1898) and in his paper *Zeit und Verfasser des Koheleth* in his *Altorientalische Forschungen*, part 10 (Leipzig, 1898) does not seem to have been aware of the fact that Siegfried's view of the composite character of Ecclesiastes was based on my lecture published in 1894. Cf. below, nn. 26, 28.

(3) According to Winckler, *op. cit.*, part 10, p. 153, the author of Ecclesiastes was the Hellenizing high-priest Alcimus (1 Macc. 7, 9) who died in 160 B. C. (1 Macc. 9, 56). But this hypothesis (cf. Cheyne-Black's EB 1164 and Matthes' paper cited below) is just as untenable as Winckler's conjectures and interpretations, *op. cit.*, part 4 (Leipzig, 1896) pp. 351-355, or his remarks on the Book of Ruth, *op. cit.*, part 16 (Leipzig, 1901) pp. 65-78, and his remarks on Canticles, *op. cit.*, part 18, pp. 236-242. Contrast my metrical version of the Book of Canticles (Chicago, 1902) reprinted from *Hebraica*, 18, 193-245; 19, 1-32. J. C. Matthes, of Amsterdam, in his paper *Die Abfassungszeit des Predigers* in the *Vienna Biblische Vierteljahrsschrift* (1904) believes that the genuine portions of Ecclesiastes were written about 150 B. C., and that the glosses were added before the end of the second century B. C.

(4) The Davidic descent of Hillel is not certain; see E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, vol. 2 (Leipzig, 1898) p. 360, n. 29.

(5) Eccl. 1, 1. 12. 16^b; cf. 2, 12^b (= I, a; VI, a. e; VII, p).

(6) They may have transposed sections VI and VII to the beginning of the Book in order to emphasize the passages which might be referred to Solomon.

(7) Like Epicurus (341-270 B. C.) Ecclesiastes commends companionship (4, 9) and cheerfulness (9, 7) but also contentment (6, 9) and moderation in sensual pleasures, to avoid painful consequences (11, 10). He warns against wrongdoing, since it entails punishment (7, 17; 5, 6). He does not deny (5, 2) the existence of God but he disbelieves a moral order of the universe; divine influence on this world, where there is so much imperfection and evil, seems to him impossible (see especially section II). In the same way he doubts the immortality of the soul (3, 21); death ends all consciousness (9, 10). He by no means commends nothing but eating, and drinking, and pleasure (8, 15; 2, 24; 5, 18; cf. 3, 12); he also preaches the gospel of work (3, 22; 9, 10). Cf. below, n. 4 on III; n. 9 on VIII.

Ecclesiastes' Epicurean *Ceterum censeo* that nought is good for man but eating, and drinking, and pleasure (8, 15; 2, 24; 5, 18; cf. 3, 12) is condemned by Jesus (Luke 12, 20) in a section which contains several allusions to the Book of Ecclesiastes (cf. Luke 12, 18 and Eccl. 2, 4; Luke 12, 20^b and Eccl. 2, 18^b, and above all, Luke 12, 27 = Matt. 6, 29 (*Solomon in all his glory*). Note also vv. 29. 30. *Mē metewpizēthe* (Luke 12, 29) means: Do not be at sea (cf. Thuc. 8, 16) *i. e.*, in a state of uncertainty, do not go astray (cf. Pol. 5, 70, 10). The Peshita renders: Let not your mind stray in these things (*wə-lā nifhē rī-yānhôn bə-hālēn*).

In the Talmud, *Epikuros* means 'freethinker'; it is there a synonym of the earlier term Sadducee 'righteous,' which seems to be a euphemism for 'unrighteous'; cf. nn. 31-34 to my paper on Ps. 1, in *Hebraica*, 19, 139 and below, n. 1 on II.

(8) Cf. *e. g.* below, n. 23 on VI.

(9) See below, n. 9 on III. Winckler (cf. above, n. 2) is right in identifying the *old and foolish king* with Antiochus Epiphanes, but the *poor and wise youth* is according to Winckler not Alexander Balas, but Demetrius I. Contrast below, n. 13 on III.

(10) See below, n. 6 on VI.

(11) See below, n. 43 on VIII.

(12) For instance, 4, 14; 10, 16; 3, 16. *Bēth-hassûrīm*, the house of outcasts (4, 14) is generally considered to be equivalent to *bēth-hā'āsûrīm*, the house of prisoners, and this interpretation may have been common soon after the publication of the Book. Alexander Jannæus had been shut up in prison by his elder brother and predecessor Aristobulus (104/3 B. C.), the first Hasmonæan King of the Jews, whose coronation is glorified in Ps. 2; see n. 22 to my paper in ZDMG 58, 629, cited below, at the end of n. 27. Neither Baumann (ZDMG 58, 587-595) nor Sievers (ZDMG 58, 864-866) have paid any attention to my remarks on Ps. 2 in *Hebraica*, 19, 134-146 and Johns Hopkins University Circulars, No. 163, p. 56, n. 17 (cf. *ibid.*, p. 90). Aristobulus' widow, Queen Salma Alexandra, was 37 years old when she married his step-brother Alexander Jannæus, and he was 24. Alexander Jannæus was also said

to be the son of a captive woman and therefore unfit for assuming priestly functions; cf. Joseph., *Ant.*, iii, 12, 2; xiii, 10, 5; 13, 5.

(13) Cf. Georg Hoffmann, *Hiob* (Kiel, 1891) p. 25.

(14) Some of the orthodox glosses are derived from the Book of Ecclesiasticus; contrast Nöldeke, ZAT 20, 91.

(15) Cf. Schürer's work, cited above, n. 4, vol. 3, pp. 97-100.

(16) Bickell, *Der Prediger über den Werth des Daseins* (Innsbruck, 1884) endeavored to show that the confusion was due to the mistake of a binder who misplaced the quires of the manuscript; but this view is untenable.

(17) Cf. I, δ. η.

(18) Cf. II, θ; IV, ε; VIII, η.

(19) Cf. II, β; V, σ; VII, ηη. θθ; VIII, τ. χ. ωω (v. 13).

(20) For instance, 10, 1^b (II, vii); 11, 8^b (VIII, xvi).

(21) See my *Book of Canticles* (cited above, n. 3) p. 19.

(22) Explanatory scribal expansions, so common in other Books of the Old Testament, are comparatively rare in Ecclesiastes; cf. e. g. II, γ-ζ; III, ε. ζ. λ. ο. π; IV, α-γ. ο-τ. αα-γγ; V, ζ. ν. ξ. ο. ττ; VI, ζ. κ. π. εε. ηη. λλ. μμ. οο; VII, α. δ-η. μ. ο. ξξ. οο; VIII, β-ζ. θ-κ. μ. ν. ο. π. ββ-δδ. θθ. Nor are there many illustrative quotations (see my remarks, ZDMG 58, 626); cf. III, β. κ. ττ; IV, ε; V, γ. ρ. υυ; VI, φ; VIII, ωω (v. 11).

(23) I interpreted the Book again during the session 1903/4, also during the session 1894/5.

(24) In Marti's *Hand-Commentar*, part 17 (Freiburg i. B., 1898).

(25) In Kautzsch, *Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments* (Freiburg i. B., 1894).

(26) In Nowack's *Handkommentar zum Alten Testament* (Göttingen, 1898); cf. above, n. 2. Siegfried asked me (March 30, 1897) to place my reconstruction of the text at his disposal, but I declined his request. His commentary showed that he had misunderstood the oral explanations which I had given him on various occasions.

(27) The translation is there printed in lines, just as Samuel Cox printed his translation of Ecclesiastes in lines, in the Expositor's Bible (London, 1890) pp. 69-110; but Cox's stichic arrangement is as unsatisfactory as Sievers' metrical analysis of the first two chapters in his *Studien zur hebräischen Metrik*, part 2 (Leipzig, 1901) pp. 563-567. According to Zapletal, *Die Metrik des Buches Kohelet* (Freiburg, Switzerland, 1904) the entire Book of Ecclesiastes, which was written in the third century B. C., is metrical, even the Epilogue; but there is no strophic division; see *op. cit.*, pp. 6. 10. 13. Zapletal's pamphlet appeared after the publication of my metrical reconstruction of Ecclesiastes in *Koheleth oder Weltschmerz in der Bibel* (Leipzig, 1905; I finished the final revision of the proofs on Sept. 15, 1904, and received the first copies of the book in Baltimore on Oct. 24, 1904) but Zapletal's prefatory note informs us that the discovery that the Book of Ecclesiastes is metrical was made by him during the session 1903/4. He was therefore in no way influenced by my metrical version of Ecclesiastes which I read at the general meeting of the Second International Congress on the History of Religions at Basle, on Sept. 1, 1904, nor by my metrical

reconstruction of the Hebrew text which I exhibited in the Semitic Section of that Congress, although Zapletal attended the Congress and read a paper on Ecclesiastes' belief in the immortality of the soul at one of the meetings of the Semitic Section. This coincidence is evidently an interesting case of sympathy, unless Zapletal exercised some telepathic influence on me, so that I was able to anticipate his discoveries before he published them. I have alluded to some similar psychic phenomena in n. 36 to my paper *The Prototype of the Magnificat in the Journal of the German Oriental Society* (ZDMG 58, 630).

(28) I stated *e. g.* in n. 5 to my lecture on Ecclesiastes, published in 1894, that the passages 2, 24^b-26 (misprinted 24^b. 26); 3, 13. 14^b. 17; 5, 6^b. 8. 18; 6, 6; 7, 13. 14. [18^b]. 20. 26^b-29 (misprinted 26^b. 29); 8, 11-13; 9, 3, &c. consisted of subsequent additions. *Ibid.*, n. 15 I pointed out that 4, 6 must be combined with 4, 4 (misprinted 7); 5, 9-11; 6, 7-9; and that 4, 5 as well as 10, 18 (misprinted 8). 15 are glosses to 4, 6 (see now section V). At the end of that note I called attention to the fact that Eccl. 7, 11. 12 must be combined with 7, 19; 8, 1; 9, 17^a; 10, 2. 3. 12. 13, and that 10, 19^b (misprinted 20^b) is a gloss to 7, 12 (see now VI, o). I added: "10, 1^b belongs to 7, 16 (*cf.* 8, 14. 10; 7, 15-18; 9, 11. 12; 8, 11-13 is a theological gloss to 8, 14, &c.) while 10, 1^a must be combined with 9, 18^b" (see now II and VI, φ). In n. 45 I stated that 2, 11-23 should be arranged in the following order: 11. 12^b. 19. 18. 20-23. 12^a. 13-17. 24-26, and that the last five words of v. 12 and vv. 16^b. 18^b were glosses (see now VI and VII).

(29) See my paper on David's Dirge in the Johns Hopkins University Circulars, June, 1903, p. 55^a.

(30) The genuine portions of Ecclesiastes, which may be arranged in eight sections, comprise 195 pairs of hemistichs with 3 + 3 beats, grouped either in couplets (Sections I, V, VIII) or in triplets (Sections II, III, IV, VI, VII). Pairs of hemistichs with 2 + 2 beats occur only in the interpolations (*cf.* IV, 5, 8, 2 ff. and VI, a. γ. η), and in one illustrative quotation (*cf.* above, n. 22) VI, φ we find 3 + 2 beats. The final section of the Book must be divided into two halves, just as I did in my lecture on Ecclesiastes published in 1894 (see above, n. 2). Each of these two halves consists of 3 and 5 couplets, respectively. Also section III must be divided into two halves, and each half consists of two stanzas, each stanza comprising two triplets. The opening section, on the other hand, consists of three stanzas, each stanza comprising four couplets. *Cf.* my strophic reconstruction of Moses' Song of Triumph (*Hebraica*, 20, 155) and the Song of Hannah (ZDMG 58, 620). In the older poetical books of the Old Testament the end of a line generally coincides with the end of a clause, but in Ecclesiastes we find a number of cases in which the end of a clause forms the beginning of the following line or hemistich. In modern poetry, as well as in Greek and Roman poems, this is, of course, quite common; but in Hebrew poetry it is comparatively rare. In the opening pair of hemistichs for instance (1, 2) we find 3 × 2 (or 4 + 2) beats instead of the regular 3 + 3 beats; in the same way we have in the second double-hemistich of section II (9, 2) 3 × 2 beats instead of 3 + 3 beats, unless we

prefer to call this a transposition of the cesura; *cf.* 3, 1; 8, 15; 5, 1; 2, 3, 4; 9, 10. 13. 14^b; 12, 5 (and the glosses 11, 7; 7, 14. 24; 1, 13; 8, 1); also Ps. 45, 4 (see note 9 on section III). *Cf.* n. 6 to my paper *The Poetic Form of Psalm 23 in Hebraica* (April, 1905).

INDEX

TO CHAPTERS AND VERSES OF THE AUTHORIZED VERSION
WITH CORRESPONDING SECTIONS, STANZAS, AND GLOSSES
IN THE PRESENT TRANSLATION.

The numerals in the first column of the subjoined table indicate chapters and verses of the traditional text of the Book of Ecclesiastes in the Authorized Version (AV). The last verse of c. 4 in the Hebrew text (LXX, Vulgate, and Luther's Bible) appears in AV as the first verse of c. 5. The last verse of c. 6 is counted in LXX, Vulgate, and Luther's Bible as the first verse of c. 7. Full-faced numerals (1, 2, &c.) refer to the chapters, ordinary numerals (1, 2, &c.) indicate verses; ^a and ^b denote first or second halves of a verse; an additional ^a or ^β means first part or second part of a half-verse; *e. g.* 9, 1^{b^a} = first part of second half (*i. e.*, third quarter) of the first verse of chapter 9.

The larger Roman numerals (I-VIII) in the second column refer to the eight sections of the present version, while the smaller Roman numerals (i-xvi) indicate the numbers of the stanzas. An additional Arabic numeral (1, 2, 3) after the number of the stanzas refers to the hemistichal pairs of a stanza; *e. g.* VI, vii, 2^a = Section VI, stanza vii, first hemistich of the second hemistichal pair. The second hemistichs of hemistichal pairs are printed in separate lines, indented, (except lines with 2+2 or 3+2 beats; see above, n. 30). The Greek letters after the larger Roman numerals, *α*, *β*, &c. refer to the glosses in the several sections. All smaller Roman numerals (i-xvi) indicate genuine portions of Ecclesiastes, while the Greek letters indicate secondary additions and interpolations. Apart from the ten glosses VII, *αα—κκ* and the gloss VIII, *ωω*, doubled Greek letters refer to tertiary glosses.

| | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 1, I : I, α | 6, I. 2 : V, viii. ix | 9, 1 ^{ba} : VIII, αα |
| 2-8 : i-v | 3 : IV, vii | β : λ |
| 9 : η | 4 : v | 2 : II, i |
| 10. 11 : vii. viii | 5 : vii | 3 : β |
| 12. 13 : VI, α | 6 : χ | 4-6 : VIII, η |
| 14-18 : i. ii | 7 : V, β | 7-10 : i-iii |
| | 8 ^a : VI, ν | 11. 12 : II, ii. iii |
| | 8 ^b : V, ε | 13. 14 : VI, vi |
| 2, I-11 : VII, i-vi | 9 : ii | 15 ^a : vii, I |
| 12 ^a : VI, iii | 10 : I, vi | 15 ^b : 3 |
| 12 ^b : VII, vii | 11 : III, iv | 16 ^a : 2 ^a |
| 13-17 : VI, iii-v | 12 ^a : VII, γ | 16 ^b . 17 : τ |
| 18 : VII, vi | 12 ^b : σ | 18 ^a : vii, 2 ^b |
| 19-24 ^a : vii-ix | | 18 ^b : φ, 2 |
| 24 ^b -26 : ηη | | |
| | 7, I. 2 ^a : III, v | |
| | 2 ^b -4 : ι | 10, 1 ^a : I |
| 3, I-8 : I, ix-xii | 5 : v | 1 ^b : II, vii, 3 |
| 9 : δ | 6 : κ | 2. 3 : VI, ο |
| 10 : VI, α | 7 : IV, ξ | 4 : IV, ξ |
| 11 : η | 8-10 : III, vi | 5-7 : i |
| 12. 13 : VII, θθ | 11. 12 : VI, ο | 8-10 ^a : VIII, vi. vii |
| 14 : VI, γ | 13. 14 : γ | 10 ^b : VI, κκ |
| 15 ^a : I, η | 15-18 ^a : II, vi. vii | 11 : VIII, vii |
| 15 ^b : IV, ε | 18 ^b : VIII, ζζ | 12. 13 : VI, ο |
| 16 : ii | 19 : VI, ρ | 14 ^a : III, ρρ |
| 17 : ε | 20 : II, η | 14 ^b : IV, μ |
| 18-22 : ii-iv | 21. 22 : IV, ξ | 15 : V, γ |
| | 23. 24 : VI, η | 16. 17 : III, ξ |
| | 25 : θ | 18 : V, γ |
| 4, I-3 : v. vi | 26-28 : VIII, υ | 19 ^a : III, ττ |
| 4 : V, i | 29 : VI, γ | 19 ^b : VI, κκ |
| 5 : γ | | 20 : IV, ξ |
| 6 : ii | | |
| 7. 8 : vi. vii | 8, I : ο | |
| 9-12 : θ | 2-6 : IV, ξ | 11, I-3 : VIII, iv. v |
| 13-16 : III, vii. viii | 7 : VIII, λ | 4 : viii |
| | 8 : ξ | 5 : ξ |
| | 9 ^a : VI, α | 6 : viii |
| 5, I. 2 : i. ii | 9 ^b : IV, ξ | 7. 8 ^{ba} : IV, χ |
| 3 : β | 10 : II, v | 8 ^{bb} : VIII, xvi, 2 ^b |
| 4-6 : iii. iv | 11-13 : θ | 9. 10 ^a : ix |
| 7 ^a : β | 14 : iv | 10 ^b : xi |
| 7 ^b : δ | 15 : VII, x | |
| 8. 9 : IV, ξ | 16 ^a : VI, η | 12, I-5 ^a : x-xiv |
| 10-12 : V, iii-v | 16 ^b : VII, δδ | 5 ^b : xvi |
| 13. 14 : x | 17 : VI, η | 6 : xv |
| 15. 16 : ρ | | 7 : χ |
| 17 : VII, γγ | | 8 : xvi |
| 18 ^a : V, xi | 9, 1 ^{aa} : β | 9-14 : ωω |
| 18 ^b -20 : σ | β : II, μμ | |

ECCLESIASTES.¹

- 1, 2 "O vanity of vanities!² vanity of vanities!² All is vanity!
 3 What profit has man of 'his toil wherewith he toils under the sun?'
 4 Generations are going and coming, while the earth is abiding for ever.
 5 The sun is rising and³ setting, rushing³ (back) to his place 'to rise there.
 6 The wind, it blows to the south, and the wind, it veers to the north, For ever veering, veering, again to resume its veerings.
 7 The streams all run to the sea, and yet is the sea never full, Although to their destination the streams are running away.⁴
-
- 8 All things are ceaselessly active;⁵ no man can enumerate all, Nor can all be seen by the eye, nor all be heard by the ear.⁶
 6, 10^b But nothing can ever contend with what is stronger than it.⁷

(a) 1, 1 The sayings of Ecclesiastes¹ (who was) a son of David (and) King¹⁹ in Jerusalem
 (β) 2 said Ecclesiastes (γ) 3 all
 (δ) 3, 9 What profit has he who works of that whereon he toils? (ε) 1, 5 the sun is (ζ) he

6, 10^a What has happened existed ⁸ aforetime;
what a man will be, is (fore)known.⁷

1, 10 Is there aught whereof we may say, vii
10, this is a thing that is new,
It was (known) in those ages aforetime
that passed before we were born.⁹

11 Whatever is past is forgotten,¹⁰ viii
and so will it be in the future;
It will not be remembered by those
who happen to live in the future.

3, 1 All lasts but a while,¹¹ and transient¹² ix
is everything under the sky:

2 Transient are births and deaths,¹³
transient are planting, uprooting.⁶

3 Transient are slaying and healing, x
transient are razing and building,

7^a Transient are rending and sewing,
5^a transient are scattering⁴ and gathering.⁵

6^b Transient are keeping and scattering,¹⁴ xi

6^a transient are seeking¹⁵ and leaving,¹⁶

5^b Transient are affection,¹⁷ aversion,⁴

8^a transient are love and hatred.

8^b Transient are warfare and peace, xii

4^a transient are weeping and laughter,

4^b Transient are wailing and triumph,¹⁸

7^b transient are silence and speaking!

(7) 1, 9 What has happened,¹⁰ will happen (again);
what was done,¹¹ (again) will be done.¹¹

3, 15^a What has happened,¹¹ will happen (again);
what is to hap, happened aforetime.¹¹

(9) 2 what is planted (1) 5^a stones (x) 5^b from affection

(11) 1, 9 Nought new is there under the sun.

(11) 3, 15 aforetime

II.

9, 2 Precisely as all things are [transient], i
 so the same fate happens to all:
 The righteous, the wicked;¹ the good,
 [the sinful];² the pure, the impure;
 Who offers, and who offers not;
 who swears, and who fears (all) swearing.³

11 Oft² under the sun have I seen ii
 that the race is not to the swift,
 Nor (does) the battle (bechance) to the strong,
 Nor (does) bread (befall) to the wise;
 Nor to the intelligent, riches;
 nor favor to men of knowledge.

On time and chance hang all things, iii
 12 'yet his own time no man knows:
 Like fishes enmeshed in a 'net,
 or birds ensnared in a springe,
 So the sons of men are entrapped
 at the time when evil 'befalls them.

8, 14 A vanity³ 'done on this earth is iv
 that righteous¹ are found whose estate
 Is the same⁴ as though they were wicked;⁵
 and wicked¹ there are whose estate

(a) 9, 2 good as well as sinful

(β) 3 This is an evil, that, no matter what is done under the sun, the same fate happens to all; yet the mind of the sons of men is full of evil,^{κκ} and afterward [they go down] to the dead.

(γ) 12 for (δ) evil (ε) suddenly (ζ) 8, 14 which is

(η) 7, 20 There is no one righteous on earth,
 who practices good and sins not.

(κκ) 9, 3 and madness is in their minds during their lives

- 8, Is the same as though they were righteous;
this also, methought, is vanity.⁴

10 And thus have I noticed the wicked¹ v
interred and entering [into peace],⁵
Excluding from sanctified ground⁶
those who had (always) done right;⁷
In the city⁶ they were forgotten;
this also, [methought,] is vanity.³

- 7, 15 'A good man may perish, though righteous;⁷ vi
a bad one may live long, though wicked.⁸

16 Be therefore not over-righteous,
neither show thyself over-wise;⁷
17 Be thou not over-wicked,
neither be thou a fool.¹

Why wilt thou ruin thyself vii
and die before thy time?

18^a Well is it to hold on to this,
and not to withdraw from that.

- 10, 1^b More precious than wisdom¹ and honor⁹
[at times]¹⁰ is somewhat of folly.¹

(9) 8, 11 Since judgment does not (always) follow
with speed, on deeds that are evil,
The mind of the sons of men
is full¹¹ in their hearts¹² to do evil.

12 But ^{λλ} if a sinner sin hundreds of times,
and lengthen the days of his life,
Yet am I (fully) assured,
it is well with those who fear God.^{13 μμ}

13 And it will not be well with the wicked,
and he will not lengthen his days,^{νν}
Who bears no fear in his heart,
of God, (nor keeps His commandments).

- (1) 7, 15 All this have I seen in the days of my vanity¹⁴

(λλ) 8, 12 since

(μμ) who fear Him 9, 1^{aβ} because the righteous and the wise¹ and their
works are in the hand of God

(νν) 13 like a shadow¹³

III.

- 5, 1 Take heed to thy feet^a whenever
 thou goest to the house of God;
 To draw nigh to listen [to homilies]^a
 is better than fools giving sacrifices;³
 For they never know [what they do,
 and never cease] to do evil. i
- 2 Be not rash with thy mouth, ii
 and in thy mind be not hasty
 To utter a word before God;
 ^a let the words (of) thy (mouth) be few!^a
 For God, He is in Heaven,⁴
 and thou art (here) upon earth.
-
- 4 Whenever thou makest a vow,⁷ iii
 put thou not off its fulfilment;⁴
 For no one takes pleasure in fools.
 Whatever thou vowest, fulfil!
- 5 Far better it is not to vow
 than vow and not to fulfil.
- 6 Let not thy mouth bring on^a guilt iv
 and then say,⁶ It is but an error;
 Lest ^aanger be roused at thy statement,
 and the work of thy hands be distrained.⁵
- 6, 11 ^aToo much talking multiplies vanities,—
 thereof what profit has man?

(a) 5, 2 therefore

(β) 3 For as dreams come from much occupation,
 so statements of fools from much talking.^{pp}

7^a In many a dream there are vanities,
 and (to) vanities (leads) much talking.

(γ) 4 to God (δ) 7^b for fear God (ε) 6 thy person

(ζ) 6 before the messenger (of the Temple) (η) God's (θ) 6, 11 for

(pp) 10, 14^a a fool talks much

- 7, 1 Far better than flavor is favor,⁶ v
 and the day of death than of birth,
 2^a And to enter a house of mourning⁷
 than enter a house of feasting,
 5 To hear the rebuke of a wiseman
 than list to the song of fools.^a
- 8 Better is ending than starting, vi
 than haughtiness better is patience.⁷
 9 Be not hasty in spirit to worry;
 this⁷ abides in the bosom of fools.
 10 'How comes it,' ask not, 'that the past'^a
 was better far than the present?'^v

-
- 4, 13 A youth, poor and wise, is better^f vii
 than a king who is old and foolish,
 And never knows how to take warning,
 [but through pride of his heart is exalted;]⁸

-
- (i) 7 2^b Since to all men this is the ending,
 let the living lay it to heart.
 3 Far better is worry than laughter,
 a sad-faced man is in tune.¹¹
 4 The mind of the wise is with mourners,
 the mind of a fool is with mirth.
- (κ) 6 Like the crackling of nettles¹² under kettles,
 so is the laughter of fools.^{σσ}
- (λ) 9 worry (μ) 10 times (ν) thou enquirest not wisely about this
- (ξ) 10, 16 Woe, thou land whose king is a boy!¹³
 whose princes eat¹⁴ in the morning.^{ττ}
 17 Hail, thou land whose king is highborn,
 whose princes eat¹⁴ at due seasons!^{υυ}

(σσ) 7, 6 this, too, is vanity

(ττ) 10, 19^a With laughter they are feasting,
 and wine gladdens life.

(υυ) 17 for strength, and not for drinking¹⁹

4, 14 Though (t)he (youth)^o be the issue of outcasts¹⁵
and born from the poor of his kingdom.⁹

15 The living who walk under the sun, viii
I noted, were all for the youth;⁷

16 No end there was of the people
before whom he stood (as a leader).
But anon they cease to admire him;
this, too, is vanity and a striving for wind.¹⁰

IV.

10, 5 One evil I saw under the sun i
is a blunder ^aon the part of the ruler:

6 The fools² are lifted on high,
while worthies⁶ remain in low station.²

7 I have noted servants on horseback,
and princes going on foot.⁷

3, 16 ^aIn the place of justice is wickedness; ii
in the place of righteousness, outrage.

18 ^aI said to myself in my heart,
for men's sake this is (permitted)
That they may¹ see and perceive
that their very selves are beasts.

(o) 4, 14 who ascended the throne¹⁵

(π) 15 the second¹⁶ who stepped in his place¹⁷

(a) 10, 5 proceeding

(β) 6 rich men

(γ) 7 like servants

(δ) 3, 16 I saw repeatedly under the sun

(ε) 17 I said (to myself) in my heart:
the righteous as well as the wicked

By God will [surely] be judged;
for a term¹¹ to every thing

And to every deed has He set;

15^b God looks after¹² him who is pursued.¹³

(ζ) 18 may be caused by God to

- 3, 19 'One fate is to man and to beast: iii
 as one dies, so dies the other;
 And all possess the same soul,²
 there is no pre-eminence in man;⁴
 20 'From dust arose (one and) all,
 and to dust shall all again turn.^{3*}
- 21 Who knows if the soul^a of man iv
 ascends on high (to heaven)?
 (Who can tell) if the soul^a of beasts
 descends below to Hades?^{4—}
 22 I have noted that nothing is better
 than the pleasure one^a takes in his work.^{5*}
- 4, 1 When I saw again (and again) v
 all oppressions^a under the sun,⁵
 And the tears of (all) the oppressed,
 with no one to right their wrongs;⁶
 The oppressors with power supreme,⁷
 with no one to right their wrongs;⁸

- (7) 19 For the fate of the sons of men
 and the fate of beasts is the same.
- (8) over the beasts (1) 20 to the same place all are wending¹⁴
- (κ) 19 for all is vanity (λ) 22 man
- (μ) 22 for this is his portion:
 For who can bring him to see
 what is to happen hereafter?¹⁵
- 10, 14^b Man cannot know aught of the future;
 who can tell him what will happen hereafter?
- (ν) 4, 1 that are practiced
- (ξ) 7, 7 Though oppression may madden a wiseman,
 a gift¹⁶ may corrupt the mind.
- 8, 9^b Sometimes a man acts the tyrant
 over others to his (own) disadvantage.¹⁷

- 4, 2 Then I praised the (lot of the) dead[•] vi
 more than that of the living who still are,[•]
 3 And happier than both [I consider]
 him who is not yet come into being,
 Who never has seen (all) the ρdoings
 that are done (here) under the sun.⁹

- 5, 8 Whenever oppression of the needy,
 deprivation of justice and right
 In any province thou notest,
 be not alarmed at the matter.

A higher one watches the high one,
 and over all is the Most High.

- 9 After all¹⁹ a country will profit—
 a civilized¹⁸ land—by a king.¹⁹

- 8, 2 I [say], Observe the king's command
 If only for the oath of God.²⁰

- 3 Do not be rash and run from him,
 Nor take a stand in bad affairs;²¹

For he can do just as he likes,²²

- 4 Who can ask him: What doest thou?²³

- 5 Who lives the law will find no harm;²⁴
 A wise mind knows due time and way,²⁴ ββ

- 6 Though one's distress lie heavy on him.

- 10, 4 Should the ruler's wrath²⁵ be stirred against thee,
 Leave not thy place, nor run from him;
 Composure abates²⁶ the greatest wrongs.

- 20 Not even in bed curse thou the king,
 Nor in thy chamber curse one in power;²⁷
 For birds of air may carry words,
 And things with wings may tell the tale!²⁸

- 7, 21 But pay no heed to every word,²⁷
 Or thou wilt hear thy servant curse thee.

- 22 At²⁸ times (indeed) thine own heart knows
 That thou thyself hast cursed thy fellows.

(ο) 4, 2 who were already dead

(π) living

(ρ) 3 evil

(αα) 8, 4 since the word of the king is supreme²⁸

(ββ) 6 there is due time and way for all things

(γγ) 7, 21 which they say

(δδ) 22 many

- 6, 3 If of children a man have a hundred, vii
 ^aand the days of his years be many,¹⁰
 And he have not plenty of happiness,^r
 an abortion is luckier than he is;^v
 5 Though it never has seen the sun,^φ
 it is far better off than that man.^x

V.

- 4, 4 I have seen^{*} that (the end of) all toiling, i
 and whatever in work is efficient,
 Is (mere) competition with neighbors;^ρ
 this, too, is vanity and a striving for wind.
 6 'A handful' with quiet is better ii
 than double handfuls^{*} with toiling.

- (σ) 6, 3 and he live a great many years
 (τ) and also if he have no burial²⁹
 (ν) 4 Though in vain it comes and goes,³⁰
 and its name is covered with darkness.
 (φ) 5 and felt (anything)
 (χ) 6 And if he should live a thousand years twice, and^{**} enjoy
 happiness, are not all going to the same place?
 11, 7 Sweet is the light, and it is fair
 for the eyes to enjoy the sun.
 8 But^{§§} live one for many a year,
 and be glad from beginning to end,³¹
 Let him bear ever in mind
 that many a dark³² day will come.
 (α) 4, 4 I
 (β) 6, 7 All the toil of a man is to eat,³³
 yet his appetite never is filled.
 (γ) 4, 5 With folded arms stands the fool,
 and his own flesh he consumes.³⁴
 10, 18 Through sloth the rafters fall in,
 the house through idleness³⁵ leaks.

(22) 6, 6 not

(ττ) 10, 18 of the hands

(§§) 11, 8 in case

- 6, 9 Better that which is seen with the eyes³
than day-dreams⁴ and a striving for wind.⁵
- 5, 10 Never sated⁶ is he who loves money; iii
and he who delights in abundance,
His income will never suffice him;⁵
this, too, is vanity and a striving for wind.
- 11 Whenever possessions increase, iv
Those also increase who consume them;
What profit then has the possessor
save the looking thereon with his eyes?⁶
- 12 The sleep of the plowman is sweet, v
whether scanty or ample his fare;
But the rich man's superabundance
will not allow him to slumber.

-
- 4, 7 Again (and again) have I noted vi
a vanity⁷ under the sun:
8 A man without a companion,
with never a son or a brother.
- And yet he toils on without ceasing, vii
his eyes are never sated with riches;
[He thinks not,] for whom am I toiling,
denying myself (every) pleasure?⁷

10, 15 Fools' toil¹³ may keep a man busy,¹⁴
who knows not the way to the town.¹⁵

- (d) 6, 9 this, too, is vanity
- (e) 8^b What (drawback) is there to a poorman
who tactfully deals with the world?¹⁶
- (f) 5, 10 with money (7) 4, 8 this, too, is vanity and hard work
- (g) 4, 9 Two are better than one;
for well their toil is rewarded.¹⁷
10 If [both] should happen to fall,
the one can raise up the other;

6, 1 There is an evil¹ I have seen under the sun, viii
and it lies very heavy on men:

2 A man to whom has been given^r
(great) wealth, and treasures, and honor;

Whereby in nought is he lacking ix
of all the desires of his heart;

But he is not allowed¹ to enjoy it—
a stranger (comes and) enjoys it.^u

5, 13 An(other) sore evil I noted:^r x
(it is) wealth guarded (close) by its owner,^z

14 But^o lost in spite of hard labor,
so that nothing^r is left⁹ for his son.^p

18^a Lo, this is what I have noted, xi
which is (truly) good and befitting:¹⁰

4. But woe unto him who falls
with no one (near) to upraise him!
11 Again, when two sleep together,
they are warm; but how is it, when single?¹⁸
12 And if one man make an attack,
two surely will withstand him.^{vv}

[sore evil
(ι) 6, 1 which (κ) 2 by God (λ) by God (μ) this is vanity and a
(ν) 5, 13 under the sun (ξ) to (the time of) his misfortune
(ο) 14 this wealth (π) at all

(ρ) 15 As he came forth from his mother's womb,
Again all naked, as he came, he goes.¹⁹

Nought at all can he take along,
in spite of toil, not a handful.²⁰

16 This evil, too, is grievous:
precisely as he came, he goes.

What profit has he who toils for wind?

(vv) 4, 12 And a threefold cord is not quickly broken

- 5, To eat, and drink, and be merry
in spite of all our toiling.^a

VI.

- 1, 14 "I have taken (due) note of all doingsⁱ
that are done (here) under the sun;^a
And lo, each one is a vanity,^a
and [all] is a striving for wind.
15 The crooked cannot be straightened,
what is lacking can not be made good."

(σ) 5, 18^b Wherewith he toils under the sun
the numbered²¹ days of his life,
Which have been allotted by God;
for this is (all of) his portion.

19 But every man to whom are given φφ
Wealth and treasures, with leave to taste xx them,
And carry off his portion, and enjoy his toiling,
(Must always hold it) a gift of God.²²

20 He will not think ψψ of his days of life,
When God absorbs²³ his mind with pleasure.

(α) 1, 12 I, Ecclesiastes,^a who (once) was King^b
Over Israel in Jerusalem,
13 Set my heart to seek and sift,¹⁰
By wisdom, all done¹ under heaven.
It is a sore task which God has given
To sons of men, whereon to fret.
3, 10 The task I have seen, which God has given
To sons of men, whereon to fret.
8, 9^a All this have I seen, and set my heart
On all the doings done¹ under the sun.

(β) 9, 1^a All this I laid to heart,
and all this saw my heart.

(γ) 7, 13 Consider the work of God:
who straightens^{aa} what He has made crooked?
14 In days that are happy, be happy;
in unhappy, consider that God

(φφ) 5, 19 by God

(xx) something of

(ψψ) 20 much

(aa) 7, 13 that

- 1, 16 'I was greater and acquired more wisdom
than any of my predecessors ;'
17 But when I set my heart to learn wisdom,^c
I learned, it was a striving for wind.'
18 More wisdom is (merely) more worry ;
and increase of knowledge, more grief.

- 7. Made both the one and the other,
but in such a way that no man
Can find out what will be hereafter;¹¹
[this, too, is vanity and a striving for wind].**

- 29 Consider but this : I have found**
That God has made all men upright;
But they have sought many inventions.¹³

- 3, 14th** Whatever God does, will be for ever;
Nought can be added, and nought subtracted.¹³
God has so done to make men fear Him.

- (d) 1, 16 I said to myself as follows: Lo, I
(ε) over¹⁴ Jerusalem, and my mind has seen¹⁵ much wisdom²¹ and²² learning
(ζ) 17 and to learn madness and folly
(η) 8, 16^a When I set my heart to learn wisdom and to consider the task
17 which is performed on the earth, I saw that man cannot find out
17 the doings which are done¹ under the sun; however much a
man may toil to seek, he cannot find it; and even if a wise man
thinks he knows (it) he cannot find it.¹⁸

- 3.** **II** All things He¹⁶ has made befitting their season;¹⁷
Yet He has veiled their mental vision,¹⁸
So that no man
What He has done can ever find out
from first to last.

- 7, 23 All this with wisdom I tested,^a
but it was beyond my reach:¹⁹**

- 24 Beyond me¹⁹ is what has been,
and deep²⁰— who can find it?**

- (BB) 3, 14 I know that all

- (γγ) 8, 17 all the doings of God

- (88) 3, 11 God (89) 7, 23 I thought I would be wise (90) 24 deep⁸⁸

2, 12^a 'When I turned to make a comparison
between wisdom, and madness, and folly,
13 I saw' that there lay some advantage
in wisdom when placed beside folly:'
14 The wise man has eyes in his head,
but fools walk (ever) in darkness.

And yet I also perceived iv
 one fate befalling them all;
 And then in my mind I remarked:
 Since the fate of the fool will^a be mine,
 What gain^u has my great wisdom brought me?^{3v}
 this also, methought^t is a vanity.^o

(♢) 7, 25 I turned my attention to learn²⁰ and to explore and investigate with wisdom²¹ and ²²reasoning.²³

(ι) 2, 13 I (κ) like the advantage of light over darkness

(λ) 15 also (μ) then for me (ξ) in my mind

(v) 6. 8^a for what advantage has the wise man over the fool?

(o) 8, 1 Who is as the wiseman?²³ and who
can interpret the (meaning of) things?
A man's wisdom illumines,²⁴
and the coarseness of his face is changed.

**7, 11 As good as a heritage is wisdom,²⁴
nay, better it is for the living;²⁵**

**12 For wisdom protects, just as money;
but wisdom^u gives life to its master.^{xx}**

10, 2 At the right²⁶ is the heart²⁷ of the wiseman,
at the left hand²⁸ the heart²⁷ of a fool ;

3 In a business²⁹ as a fool undertakes,
 he reveals to all, he is a fool.

**12 The words of³⁰ the wise are grace(ful),
but the lips of a fool embroil³¹ him.**

**13 The first words of his mouth are folly,
and the last of his mouth is madness.**

(77) 7, 25 that is, to learn that wickedness is foolishness,⁸ and folly madness

(३३) 8. i his face (u) 7, 12 the advantage of knowledge is :

(κκ) 10, 10^bthe advantage of wisdom²¹ is efficiency

IQ^b yet money grants every thing

(22) 3 as soon as (μμ)his mind fails him (νν) 13 evil

- 2, 16 The wiseman is not remembered v
 no more than the fool, for ever.⁷
 17 So life became to me hateful,
 disgust overcame me at⁴ the doings
 That are done (here) under the sun;
 all is vanity and a striving for wind.
-

- 9, 13 I once saw (an instance of) wisdom⁵ vi
 under the sun, which deeply impressed me:
 14 A small town there was, with few in it,
 and a powerful king came against it,
 And to it laid siege, and erected
 against it powerful bulwarks.⁶

 15^a Now there was in the town a poor wiseman vii
 who delivered the place by his wisdom;⁸
 16^a And I thought,⁹ above valor is wisdom,⁷
 18^a "above weapons of war is wisdom;⁸
 15^b But the people bore not in remembrance
 that man so poor (and so wise).⁷
-

(π) 2, 16^b inasmuch as in future days everything will have been forgotten;
 and how does the wiseman die?—just as the fool!

(ρ) 7, 19 A wiseman's wisdom is stronger
 than ten rulers who are¹⁰ in the city.

(σ) 9, 16^a I, far¹¹ (v) 18 far¹²

(τ) 16^b But the wisdom of the poor is despised,
 and no one takes heed to his words;

17 Though the tranquil words of the wiseman¹³
 top the shout of the king of fools.¹⁴

(φ) 10, 1^a A fly that is dead may make rancid¹⁵ the spicer's balm;¹⁶
 9, 18^b One man who is a traitor¹⁷ may ruin much that is good.

(ξξ) 7, 19 were

(∞) 9, 17 are heard (above)

(***) 10, 1^a fetid

VII.

- 2, 1 I said to myself in my heart: i
 Come on, I will try thee with pleasure:
 [Take pleasure] and have a good time!
 but lo, even this, too, was vanity.
 2 Of laughter I thought, it is mad;
 and of pleasure, what does it avail?¹
 3 I revolved in my mind how to quicken² ii
 my flesh,² and to lay hold on folly,
 Until I might (clearly) discover
 what is good for the sons of men,
 Which they may enjoy³ under the sky
 the numbered⁴ days of their life.⁵
 4 I engaged in great works, and I built me iii
 (large) mansions, and planted me vineyards;
 5 I laid out gardens and parks,
 and planted⁵ all sorts of fruit trees.
 6 Pools⁶ also I made me to water⁷
 a nursery full of young trees.⁶
 7^a Both bondmen and bondmaids I purchased, iv
 and slaves were born in my house;⁷
 8 I amassed both silver and gold,
 and the products of realms and of regions.
 I got singers, both male and female,
 and the delights of the sons of men.⁸

(a) 2, 3 with wine (β) but my mind was guiding with wisdom¹⁷

(γ) 6, 12^a For who knows what is good for man¹⁸
 the numbered⁴ days of his μμvanity?¹⁹

(δ) 2, 6 of water (ε) from them

(ζ) 7^b I also had plenty of cattle,²⁰
 more than any of my predecessors.²⁰

(η) 8 a mistress and mistresses¹⁸

(λλ) 6, 12^a in life (μμ) life of (νν) that is, he spends them like a shadow²¹

(ξξ) 2, 7^b herds and flocks (οο) in Jerusalem

- 2, 9 I was great, more eminent than any v
ever before in Jerusalem.⁴
- 10 Whatever my eyes desired,
that, I withheld not from them;
Nor did I deny my heart 'pleasure';⁵
and this was my portion in ¹my toil.
-
- 11 For when I turned to "the toil(s)" vi
which I had toiled to create,
Behold, it was vanity all,⁶
there is no profit under the sun.
- 18 So I hated⁶ all my toil(s)⁷
wherein I toiled under the sun.⁸
- 12^b For what⁸ will he⁹ be who succeeds me?⁹ vii
19 "and who knows if wise he will be"
Yet will he rule over all my toil(s)⁷
which have cost me such toil and such wisdom.^{9v}
- 20 So at last I began⁶ to despair¹⁰
concerning all toils⁷ of my toiling.^x
- 21 For is there¹¹ a man who has toiled viii
with wisdom, and knowledge, and skill,
To him who has not toiled for it
he must leave¹² it.¹¹ This, too, is vanity!¹²

-
- (⁹) 2, 9 but my wisdom(always) remained with me
- (¹) 10 any (^κ) for my mind had pleasure of all my toil (^λ) all
- (^μ) 11 all the works which my hands had created and
- (^ν) and a striving for wind (^ε) 18 I
- (^ο) 18 because I must leave it to my successor
- (^π) 12^b the man (^ρ) the king whom they have already appointed
- (^σ) 6, 12^b For who can tell any man,
what will be after him under the sun?¹³
- (^τ) 2, 19 or foolish (^υ) this, too, is vanity (^φ) 20 I
- (^χ) 20 under the sun (^ψ) 21 his portion (^ω) and a great evil

- 2, 22 What then accrues¹³ to a man
from "his toil and the striving of his mind?"¹⁴
- 23 Though all his days be grievous,¹⁴ ix
and his task be full of worry,¹⁵
And his mind find no rest at night;¹⁶
this, too, is (all) but vanity.
- 24^a Nought is good " but to eat, and drink,
and (try) " to have a good time.¹⁶¹⁷
- 8, 15 So pleasure I commend, x
since nought is good " for man "
But eating, and drinking, and pleasure,
which to him will cling in his toil
Throughout his allotment of days "
under the sun ; [his portion it is.]
-
- (αα) 2, 22 all (ββ) whereon he toils under the sun
- (γγ) 5, 17 Even if his days are all gloomy,²⁰
and full of sorrow and worry.²¹
- (δδ) 8, 16^b Even if by day and by night
he does not get any sleep.²²
- (εε) 2, 24 for man (ζζ) in spite of his toil
- (ηη) Again have I also seen
that this depends²¹ upon God ;
- 25 For who can find pleasure in eating
and in any sensation²² without Him ?
- 26 To the man whom He deems good,²³
He gives wisdom, and knowledge, and pleasure ;
But on the sinner He imposes the task
of gathering, amassing, and yielding it
To him whom God deems good;²⁴
this, too, is vanity and a striving for wind.
- (θθ) 3, 12 I know, there is nothing good²⁴
but pleasure and enjoyment²⁵ of life.
- 13 But every man (on the earth)
who eats, and drinks, and enjoys
Any happiness in all of his toiling,
(must hold it as) a gift of God.²⁶
- (ιι) 8, 15 under the sun (κκ) (allotted to him) by God
-
- (ππ) 5, 17 and illness and vexation (ρρ) 8, 16^b in his eyes

VIII.

- 9, 7 Go, eat thy bread with pleasure, i
 and drink thy wine with cheer;^{*}
 8 And white be (all) thy garments,^o
 and oil for the head unfailing.¹
 9 Be happy^{*} with a woman⁷ thou lovest, ii
 through all the days of thy vanity;^{3o}
 For this is thy portion in life,
 in thy toiling^{*} under the sun.
 10 Whatever thy hand may find iii
 to do with thy strength—do it!⁴
 For work there is none, nor planning,
 nor knowledge, nor wisdom in Sheol.^{6o}

-
- II, 1 Send thy breadcorn across the^o water, iv
 though it take many days,—thou wilt regain it;
 2 But apportion it 'twixt seven or^o eight (ships);⁵
 for what^{*} may happen, thou knowest not.⁴

-
- (a) 9, 7 when God has sanctioned thy doings
 (β) 8 throughout all time (γ) 9 whom
 (δ) 9 Allotted to thee under the sun
 (through) all the days of thy vanity.³
 (ε) wherewith thou art toiling (ζ) 10 whither thou art going
 (η) 4 because for him who is associated with all the living, there is
 some hope; for indeed "a living dog is better than a dead lion."
 5 Though the living know that they must die, the dead do not
 know anything, and they have no reward any more; for their
 6 memory is forgotten—their love as well as their hate,^{aa} and
 their passions are all over, and nevermore have they any
 share in anything that is done under the sun
 (θ) II, 1 face of the (ι) 2 even to (κ) evil on the earth
 (λ) 8, 7 As he knows not what will happen;
 who can tell him when it will happen?
 9, 1b^o Man knows not all that is in store for^{3o} him

-
- (aa) 9, 1b^o love as well as hatred

11, 3 If clouds be full [of water], v
 they pour down rain on the earth;
 If southward^μ a tree should fall,⁶
 wherever it^ν fall, there it lies.[‡]

10, 8 Whoso digs a pit may fall in it,⁷ vi
 who pulls down,^ο—a snake may bite;⁸
 9 Who quarries stones may be hurt therewith;
 who cleaves wood, may be injured.

10^{*} If the [edge of the] iron be blunt,^{*} vii
 it needs more strength [in the using].⁹
 11 If the snake, before charming, should bite,
 his charms avail not the charmer.¹⁰

11, 4 Who watches the wind will not sow, viii
 who looks to the clouds will not reap;¹¹
 6 So scatter thy seed in the morning,
 withhold not thy hand at evening.^{12, ρ}

(μ) 11, 3 or northward

(ν) the tree

(ξ) 8, 8 No man has control of the wind,^{ββ}
 nor is any control of the death-day,
 Just as no release is in war;³⁰
 nor will wickedness save its adherents.

11, 5 Inasmuch as thou dost not know
 the (future) course of the wind,
 Or the bones in the womb of the pregnant,⁴⁰
 even so canst thou never know
 [Every] work (and action) of God
 who does (and ordains) all this.

(ο) 10, 8 a wall⁴¹ (π) 10 that is, if he has not ground the (ax-)head

(ρ) 11, 6 For thou knowest not which will thrive,^{γγ}
 Or whether both will be good alike.

(ββ) 8, 8 to check the wind

(γγ) 11, 6 the one or the other

11, 9 Take pleasure, O youth, in thy boyhood,¹³ ix
 in the days of thy youth be^r joyous!^r
 10^a Cast worrying out of thy mind,
 but keep away ills from thy body!^{14v}

12, 1 Remember thy well¹⁵ in[†] thy youth, x
 ere the days of evil approach,
 And the years draw nigh wherein,
 thou wilt say, I have no pleasure.

2 Ere the sun become obscured, xi
 and the light, and the moon, and the stars;
 The clouds return after rain,
 11, 10^b for boyhood and black hair are vanities.¹⁶

12, 3 When the keepers of the house¹⁷ are trembling, xii
 and the men of strength¹⁸ are bending;

(σ) 11, 9 thy mind

(τ) Just walk in the ways of thy heart
 and in the sight of thine eyes;⁴²
 But know that for all these things
 to judgment God will bring thee!

(υ) 7, 26 I find more bitter than death
 a woman⁴³ who is (all) snares;⁴⁴
 He who is good⁴⁵ will escape her;⁴⁶
 but he who is sinful, be caught.

27 Lo, this I have found out,⁴⁷ (counting)
 one by one,⁴⁸ to reach the result:⁴⁹

28 One man in a thousand I found;⁵⁰
 but a woman, ever sought
 By my soul, but never found,⁵¹
 among them all I found not.

(φ) 12, 1 in the days of

(δδ) 7, 26 and her heart a great net, and her arms fetters (εε) before God

(ζζ) 18^b For he who fears God will escape them all⁵²

(ηη) 27 said Ecclesiastes⁵³

- 12; The grinders¹⁹ quit work, though they are few;
Those who look through the windows²⁰ are [darkened.
4 And barred are the doors of egress,²¹ xiii
since low is the sound of the mill;²²
And we rise at the birds' first cheep,²³
though all daughters of music be muffled.²⁴
- 5^a Whatever is high, we fear;²⁵ xiv
and every walk is a terror.²⁶
The almond tree blossoms;²⁷ and inert²⁸
lies the chrysalis,²⁹ till the soul³⁰ emerges.³¹
- 6 Ere the cord of silver³² be snapped, xv
and the golden bowl³³ be shattered,
The pitcher at the fountain be shattered,³⁴
and the wheel³⁵ at the well breaks down.^x
- 5^b For he^ψ goes to his home everlasting,³⁶ xvi
and the mourners³⁷ go about in the street.
- 8 O vanity!^ω all is vanity!
11, 8^b and all that is coming is vanity!^{ωω}

(χ) 12, 7 the dust shall return to the earth (to become) what it was; but the soul⁴⁸ shall return to God who gave it

(ψ) 5^b man (ω) 8 said Ecclesiastes⁴⁹

(ωω) 9 In addition to the fact that Ecclesiastes⁴⁹ was a wise man, he continually taught the people knowledge,⁴⁹ thinking out, and
10 composing, and arranging many lines.⁵⁰ Ecclesiastes tried to find pleasing⁵¹ words, but what is written is correct.^{52 53}

11 Words of the wise are like points of goads,
But (firm) as nails^u are the verses of a poem.^{53 54}

12 Besides, my son, be on your guard against these (sayings);⁵⁴
endless is the making of books⁵⁵ in great numbers; but too much reading wearies the flesh.⁵⁶

13 Let us hear the end of all this talk: Fear God and keep His
14 commandments; that is (what) every man (ought to do).⁵⁷ God will bring all doings into the judgment upon all that is hidden,⁵⁸ be it good or evil.

[leader.⁶⁰

(ψθ) 12, 10 words of truth (u) 11 driven in (κκ) they were given by one

NOTES ON ECCLESIASTES.

I.

(1) The Greek word Ecclesiastes (Heb. *Kohleth*) does not denote an ecclesiastic or preacher, but one who addresses an *ecclesia*, or assembly, a public speaker (Lat. *contionator*) or lecturer (French *conférencier*) especially a public teacher of philosophy; cf. 12, 9 (VIII, ωω).

(2) Lit., breath of breaths, *i. e.*, How utterly transitory is everything. The Heb. term *hebl* means primarily breath, then anything as unsubstantial as a breath, anything that is in vain, *i. e.*, vanishes as easily as a breath; hence a vain pursuit, a fruitless effort (cf. n. 10 on III). All is vain, without any real value, unsubstantial and idle, fruitless, ineffectual, useless, futile, unavailing. Ecclesiastes uses the term *vanity* also in the sense of a fact illustrating the vanity of everything, *e. g.* 8, 14 (II, iv): A vanity done on this earth is, and 4, 7 (V, vi): I have noted a vanity under the sun. Cf. n. 5 on VI.

(3) Lit., snorting. This refers to the horses (*Phoebe anhelii equi*, Ovid, *Metamorph.* 15, 418) of the chariot of the sun (2 K 23, 11). The Heb. verb does not mean 'to pant from fatigue.'

(4) Lit., to the place whither the streams are going, there they return to go.

(5) Lit., wearying themselves; cf. n. 14 on V.

(6) Lit., the eye is not satisfied with seeing, and the ear is not filled with hearing.

(7) Overruling necessity, destiny.

(8) Lit., his name was called, an old Babylonian phrase for *to exist*. The cuneiform account of Creation begins: At the time when the heavens above were not called, nor the earth below had a name. A name is the expression of the impression; cf. Gen. 2, 19.

(9) Lit., it was already in the ages that were before us.

(10) Lit., there is no remembrance of former things.

(11) Lit., to all there is a while, *i. e.*, a (short) space of time; cf. n. 11 on IV.

(12) Prop., temporary; lit., to everything there is a time. Nothing is timeless, termless, interminable.

(13) Just as the sea is never full, owing to the constant evaporation (Job 36, 27; JAOS 17, 162) of the water, although all streams run into it, so deaths counterbalance births. If the number of births increases, the mortality among the infants increases; if a great many people die, owing to epidemics, wars, famines, &c., this loss is offset by a marked increase in the number of marriages and births; so births and deaths are transient just as all other human actions. The power of conception and

the capability of parturition last but a certain time (about thirty years), and mortality is greater in certain periods of life: it is high among infants; then it decreases up to the thirteenth year, when it begins to increase again. Even the greatest mortality in the most deadly epidemics lasts but a limited period. The Black Death in the xivth century raged for three years, 1348-1351, but was followed by a period of great blessings with a marked increase in the birth-rate. In the times of the Maccabees a philosopher in Palestine might have observed the same phenomena which we find in Germany after the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648). The first three decades (170-143) of the Maccabean period (167-63 B. C.) might be called, in some respects, the Thirty Years' War of Palestine.

(14) Dropping, casting off.

(15) For instance, a lost sheep (Ps. 119, 176); cf. n. 12 on IV.

(16) To perish in the wilderness, &c. Abandoning, forsaking.

(17) Lit., embracing and being distant.

(18) Lit., exulting, leaping for joy.

(19) This may mean 'head of a school.'

(20) In nature. (21) By men; cf. 1, 14; 8, 19^a (VI, i and a).

(22) Hölderlin's Empedokles says,

*Geh! Fürchte nichts, Es kehret alles wieder,
Und was geschehen soll, ist schon geschehen.*

II.

(1) Righteous=orthodox, wise=godfearing; wicked=unorthodox, freethinker, Hellenizer; fool=agnostic, atheist; cf. Pss. 14, 1; 111, 10 (see also n. 15 on V and n. 36 on VI). In Dan. 12, 3 the faithful (orthodox) Jews are called *they that are wise* (or *of understanding*); cf. v. 10. The Book of Daniel was written about 164 B. C. when Ecclesiastes was perhaps ten years old.

(2) Lit., I returned and saw, *i. e.*, I saw again (and again); I saw repeatedly; cf. IV, v; V, vi.

(3) Cf. note 2 on section I and n. 3 on VI.

(4) Lit., to whom it happens according to the work of the wicked.

(5) Cf. Isaiah 57, 2; Wisdom of Solomon 3, 3.

(6) That is, the holy city of Jerusalem. The Arabic name of Jerusalem is *el-Kuds*, Holiness.

(7) For instance, Judas Maccabæus (1 Macc. 9, 18) and his elder brother Simon (1 Macc. 16, 16).

(8) Cf. Job 21, 7-15; 12, 6; Jer. 12, 1. (9) Dignity.

(10) Cf. *e. g.*, 1 Macc. 2, 41; Matt. 12, 1 ff.; Luke 14, 5.

(11) Big, prone.

(12) Lit., in them.

(13) Socrates was convinced that no one could harm a righteous man, since God would not forsake him; cf. 3, 15^b (IV, ε) and nn. 12, 23 on IV.

(14) In spite of the short duration of my life; cf. n. 3 on VIII.

(15) Cf. 6, 12^a (VII, vv).

III.

(1) Do not keep running to the Temple heedlessly, merely out of habit, or out of regard for other people. Consider when thou goest to the Temple, whither, why, and wherefore thou art going.

(2) Expounding the Scriptures.

(3) Cf. 1 S 15, 22; Is. 1, 11. 16; Mic. 6, 6-8.

(4) Ecclesiastes believed that God was not only distinct from the world, but also separated from it. According to Epicurus (cf. above, n. 7 to the Introduction) the gods resided in the *intermundia*, the spaces between the worlds. The Heb. word for *heaven* means also *ether*, *upper air*; cf. the birds of heaven, i. e. the air, e. g. in 10, 20 (IV, 5).

(5) If a man made a vow which he afterwards repudiated, on the plea that he had made a mistake, he was liable to attachment; his property might be seized as security for the payment of the vow and held as a pledge until satisfaction be made.

(6) That is, high favor with the people; a good reputation is better than the finest flavor (cf. our *the odor of his good name* and *a name of evil savor*, a malodorous reputation) sweeter than the most precious perfume; cf. Cant. 1, 3: thy name is (thrice-) clarified perfume; see my *Book of Canticles* (cf. n. 21 on the Introduction) n. 21 on No. 7. There is a paronomasia in the Hebrew: *ṭōv-šēm miššēm ṭōv*; cf. below, n. 12.

(7) Quiet submission to the will of fate (cf. I, vi), unresisting acquiescence, resignation.

(8) Cf. 2 Macc. 5, 17.

(9) This poor and wise youth is the young king Alexander Balas of Syria (150-145 B. C.) who was a great friend of the Jews (1 Macc. 10, 47). The old and foolish king, on the other hand, is the arch-enemy of the Jews, Antiochus Epiphanes (175-164). Old = patrician, aristocratic; cf. elder = prince, chief and our *old man*. For *wise* = religious, friend of the Jewish religion, and *foolish* = irreligious, see n. 1 on II. Alexander Balas was a boy of very humble origin (Justin says, *sortis extremae juvenis*), but pretended to be a son of Antiochus Epiphanes, and his claims were supported (Justin says, *totius ferme orientis viribus subcinctus*) not only by Attalus II. Philadelphus (159-138) of Pergamum, Ariarathes V. Philopator (162-130) of Cappadocia, and Ptolemy VI. Philometor (181-145) of Egypt, but also by the Jews under the Maccabee Jonathan (161-143) and even by the Roman Senate.

Ps. 45 seems to be the Heb. version of the Greek *carmen nuptiale* which Jonathan presented at the wedding of Alexander Balas and the Egyptian princess Cleopatra, which was celebrated at Ptolemais in 150 B. C. (1 Macc. 10, 58). It is important to note that this poem does not allude to the ancestry of the groom, only his personal virtues are extolled, while the bride is advised to forget her father's house (the famous dynasty of the Ptolemies) and to submit to the King, should he desire her beauty. This marriage was not a love-match but a political union: three years after the wedding Cleopatra left her young husband and mar-

ried his antagonist, Demetrius II. Nicator, the son of Demetrius I. Soter who is alluded to in Ps. 45 (v. 7) as the rival of the groom.

Ps. 45 is to be rendered as follows :

- A love-song with skill I indite, i
 1^b reciting a poem on the King ;
 1^a My mind overflows with good thoughts,
 1^c a ready scribe's pen is my tongue.
- 2 Thy beauty is fairer than human, ii
 thy lips with grace are bedewed ;
 Therefore men^a bless thee for ever,
 3^b and give to thee honor and praise.
- 3^a Gird thou thy sword on thy hip, iii
 4 { } O hero ! hail to thee ! ride
 For truth's sake and humble rightness,*
 and wonders thy right hand will show thee.
- 5^a Thine arrows so sharp { do thou notch, } iv
 5^c and under thee nations will fall ;
 5^b The foes of the King will perish,
 [and, like a snake, lick the dust.]**
- 6 Thy throne^s is for ever and ever, v
 a sceptre of right is ^rthy kingdom ; †
 7 Thou lovest right, and wrong thou hatest,
 hast therefore vanquished^d thy rival. ‡
-
- 12() With tribute gladden thy face vi
 the richest, { with gold of Ophir ; } §
 9 But thy brightest gem^e is the princess
 who stands at thy right as thy consort. { }
- 8 (With) myrrh, with cassia, and aloes vii
 are (fragrant) all of her garments ;
 From the ivory palace (resound)
 [the harps and lutes] (to) salute her.
- 13() The princess { } in brocaded garments viii
 with gold most richly embroidered ;
 14 The noble virgin is brought to the King, { }
 escorted by her own playmates. ¶

* That is, for the Jewish cause. ** Cf. Mic. 7, 17. † Balas was an impostor.

‡ That is, Demetrius I. (see below, n. 16). The literal translation of this line is: therefore *God, thy God*, has anointed thee *with the oil of gladness* above thy fellow.

§ That is, Rhodesia ; see Johns Hopkins University Circulars, No. 163, p. 53, n. 21.

- 10 Oh hearken^a and incline thine ear, ix
forget thy race and thy father's house !
11 Should the King desire thy beauty,
submit ; for he is thy lord.
16 In place of thy fathers, thy sons,— x
the princes of earth thou wilt make them ;
17 Thy name will they make ever^{*} famous,
[^] extolled wilt thou be^μ for ever.*

-
- | | | | | | |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|------------------------|-----|----------------|
| (a) | 2 God | (β) | 6 O God | (γ) | the sceptre of |
| (δ) | 7 through God, thy God, with the oil of triumph | | | | |
| (ε) | 13 in all the treasure | (ζ) | 12 that is, the Tyrian | (η) | 13 within |
| (θ) | 15 They are brought with joy and rejoicing ; they enter the palace of the king. | | | | |
| (ι) | 10 O maiden and see | | | (κ) | 17 and ever |
| (λ) | 17 therefore | | | (μ) | by the peoples |

The general enthusiasm for Alexander Balas did not last long: his own father-in-law, Ptolemy VI. of Egypt turned against him, and he was defeated by Demetrius II. in 145 B. C. He fled to Arabia, and five days after the battle his head was brought to Ptolemy—an illustration of Ecclesiastes' saying: 'tis all vanity and a striving for wind.

Transient are seeking and leaving,
transient are affection, aversion,
Transient are love and hatred,
transient are wailing and triumph !

(10) That is, a vain pursuit, a fruitless effort (not *vexation of spirit*) ; cf. Hos. 12, 1: Ephraim strives for wind and pursues the eastwind, *i. e.*, they strive for what is unattainable, beyond reach. Cf. above, n. 2 on I.

(11) That is, in the right mood, in the proper frame of mind, lit., in the badness (*i. e.*, sadness) of the face the heart (*i. e.*, the mind) is good. Contrast VIII, i.

(12) Lit., thorns. There is a word-play (cf. above, n. 6, and n. 8 on IV) between *str* 'pot' and *strim* 'thorns' in the Hebrew (*Kē-qōl hassirim taht-hassir*). The term *strim* may denote the thorny burnet (*poterium spinosum*) which is a most combustible fuel. Thorny and prickly plants abound in Palestine.

(13) This gloss appears to refer to Alexander Balas, who gave himself to self-indulgence, just as his antagonist Demetrius I. and Demetrius I.'s uncle, Antiochus Epiphanes were drunkards. Justin says: *Alexandrum insperatae opes et alienae felicitatis ornamenta velut captum inter scortorum greges desidem in regia tenebant*. With the Jews, however,

* Cf. my notes on the Hebrew text in *Hebraica*, 19, 136.

Balas was popular (1 Macc. 10, 47) in spite of his doubtful origin and his failings. The present gloss expresses a different opinion.

(14) Feast.

(15) Lit., from a house of outcasts (Ewald, *Verworfenen*) he came forth to reign. The Hebrew term *šūrim* suggests the name of the Syrians and the idea of apostasy or heathenism.

(16) The first was Demetrius I. (162-150 B. C.). Balas reigned 150-145. The glossator has evidently overlooked the brief reign of the young son and successor of Antiochus Epiphanes, Antiochus V. Eupator, who reigned 164-162. Similarly Strabo XVI, 2, 40 (p. 762) disregards the brief reign of Aristobulus I. (104/3) and states that Alexander Jannæus was the first Hasmonean ruler who assumed the regal title, although Aristobulus styled himself King of the Jews. Cf. n. 12 on the Introduction.

(17) Cf. Dan. 11, 20, 21.

(18) Carousing.

IV.

(1) At the time of the Syrian dominion under Antiochus Epiphanes and his successors many unworthy persons, who betrayed the Jewish cause and sympathized with the Greeks, attained great prominence, while the noblest of the faithful Jews were humiliated. Cf. e. g. 1 Macc. 7, 9; 9, 25; 2 Macc. 4, 8, 13, 19, 25. For *fools* see n. 1 on II.

(2) Lit., spirit; cf. n. 48 on VIII.

(3) Contrast 12, 7=VIII, 8; also 2 Macc. 7, 9, 14, 36; 12, 44; 14, 46.

(4) Lit., earth, i. e., the netherworld; cf. my note on Exod. 15, 12 (*Hebraica*, 20, 161).

(5) Constant occupation is a blessing in this world; cf. nn. 4 and 12 on VIII.

(6) That is, the wrongs inflicted *upon* them.

(7) Lit., and in the hands of their oppressors power.

(8) That is, the wrongs inflicted *by* them. The Heb. has in both cases: and there was no *menahhēm* for them; but *menahhēm* means in the first case *comforter*, in the second case *avenger*. The German *Tröster* means not only *comforter*, but also a *club* or rod for inflicting punishment. Cf. n. 12 on III.

(9) Similar pessimistic ideas are repeatedly expressed by Greek writers; cf. Theognis, 425-428; Soph., *Oed. Col.*, 1225-1228. In Cicero, *Tusc.*, 1, 48 we read: *Non nasci homini longe optimum esse, proximum autem quam primum mori*. Even Socrates regarded death as a recovery from a disease.

(10) Numerous progeny and longevity was the ancient Hebrew ideal of happiness. Cf. Pss. 127, 5; 128, 3 (*Hebraica*, 11, 143, 150)—Exod. 20, 12; Deut. 5, 16; Ephes. 6, 2; Deut. 4, 40; 6, 2; 22, 7; 1 K 3, 14.

(11) Cf. n. 11 on I.

(12) Lit., seeks, i. e., takes care; He does not leave them in the lurch; cf. n. 15 on I.

(13) Persecuted; cf. n. 1.

(14) This addition may be based on the Horatian *Omnes eodem cogimur* (published about 23 B. C.).

(15) Lit., look at that which he will be after him; cf. VI, γ; VII, σ; VIII, λ. Socrates declared that he did not know what was in store for us after death, but he cherished the hope of a life beyond.

(16) Or bribe (cf. e. g. 1 Macc. 2, 18). Oppression, persecution, adversity often develop the sterling qualities of men, while favor (especially bribes) leads to corruption.

(17) Schiller says, *Allzustraff gespannt, zerspringt der Bogen*. Wellhausen quotes this phrase at the beginning of c. 17 of his *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* (Berlin, 1904) p. 258, to characterize the conditions preceding the Maccabean rising in 167 B. C.

(18) Lit., tilled, cultivated.

(19) In spite of all drawbacks a monarchy is best suited to an agricultural country with a settled population. Cf. e. g. Joseph., *Ant.*, xvi, 9, 1; xvii, 2, 1. Even Herod was a good ruler up to a certain point.

(20) The oath of allegiance; cf. Joseph., *Ant.*, xv, 10, 4; xvii, 2, 4; see also Matt. 22, 21; Rom. 13, 1. Socrates strongly emphasized the necessity of obedience to the state and its laws.

(21) Conspiracy, &c. Cf. e. g. Joseph., *Ant.*, xv, 8, 3.

(22) Who can criticize his actions? Even kings under Roman sovereignty (*reges socii*) had absolute power of life and death over their subjects.

(23) Lit., who observes the law will experience no evil. A law-abiding citizen will be unmolested, cf. n. 13 on II.

(24) There will be a day of reckoning; but premature rebellion is unwise.

(25) Lit., if the ruler's spirit should rise against thee.

(26) Lit., causes to rest, stop.

(27) Lit., a rich man; cf. gloss β. Rich (cf. Lat. *rex* and German *Reich* = empire) meant originally powerful, mighty, noble, ruling.

(28) Herod the Great employed a great many spies; often he went out himself at night, in disguise, in order to ascertain the feelings of the Jews toward his government; cf. Joseph., *Ant.*, xv, 10, 4; 8, 4.

(29) Not to have a burial was considered one of the greatest of calamities. At the end of the Babylonian Nimrod Epic we read: He whose dead body is left in the field, his spirit finds no rest in the earth; he whose spirit has no one to take care of him, must eat the dregs of the pot, the remnants of food that lie in the street. Cf. 1 Macc. 7, 17; 2 Macc. 5, 10; 13, 7.

(30) Lit., it comes in(to) vanity and goes in(to) darkness.

(31) Lit., rejoice in them all.

(32) Cf. n. 20 on VII.

(33) The present German Emperor is said to have written in the Golden Book of Munich: *Suprema lex regis voluntas*, an autocratic modification of the Ciceronian *Salus publica suprema lex*; cf. Juvenal's *Hoc volo, sic jubeo; sit pro ratione voluntas*.

V.

(1) More accurately, *palm*, flat of the hand.
 (2) More exactly, hollows of the hand.
 (3) Lit., the sight of the eyes, *i. e.*, what is within our reach.
 (4) Lit., wandering of the soul, *i. e.*, extravagant wishes, castles in the air. We must strive for what is within reach, not for that which is beyond it.

(5) Lit., will have no income.
 (6) There is no permanent gain, it vanishes under his eyes; he can not enjoy it all, he can feast his eyes thereon only as long as it lasts.
 (7) *Cf.* n. 2 on I. (8) Lit., there is no end to all his toil.
 (9) Lit., and if he has begotten a son, there is nothing in his hand.
 (10) This can hardly be a Heb. imitation of the Greek phrase *καλὸν κάγαθόν*. The meaning of the Greek term is different; *καλὸς κάγαθός* is a gentleman, and *καλὸν κάγαθόν* means a noble act. *Cf.* n. 57 on VIII.

(11) Lit., for his mouth.
 (12) Inactivity and indifference are foolish and suicidal.
 (13) An absurd enterprise, a fool's or gawk's errand.
 (14) Lit., may weary him, *cf.* n. 5 on I.
 (15) That is, one who is so stupid that he does not know how to go to town. Is. 35, 8 affords no parallel; there *fools* is equivalent to *ungodly*, *cf.* n. 1 on II. The phrase seems to be proverbial like our *who does not know enough to come in when it rains*, or the French *il ne trouverait pas de l'eau à la rivière*, or the German (a blockhead) *mit dem man Wände einrennen könnte*.

(16) Lit., who knows how to walk before the living, *i. e.*, possesses *savoir-faire* and *savoir-vivre*.

(17) Nietzsche would have said: *Zweisiedler sind besser daran als Einsiedler*. If a man stands alone, he cannot enjoy the result of his work so well as the man who can share his pleasure with someone near him. If a man is successful in his toil, and can use his gain to make his family or his friends happy, he will have a better reward than the solitary man. Even honors and recognition afford less satisfaction if we have no one near us to share our pleasure.

(18) Lit., but the one, how can he be warm?

(19) *Cf.* Job 1, 21; Ps. 49, 17; 1 Tim. 6, 7.

(20) Lit., which he may take away in his hand.

(21) See n. 4 on VII.

(22) *Cf.* 3, 13 (VII, θθ).

(23) Engrosses, occupies; see the last paragraph of n. 47 to my paper *Babylonian Elements in the Levitic Ritual* (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, 19, 71). LXX, ὁ θεὸς περισπᾷ αὐτόν; Vulgate, *Deus occupet deliciis cor ejus*.

VI.

(1) *Cf.* n. 21 on I.

(2) See n. 2 on I.

(3) Lit., wherefore have I been so very wise?

(4) Lit., evil upon me were.

(5) Lit., also this I saw as wisdom under the sun, and it was great to me. Wisdom means also a *wise act*, just as *vanity* is used for a *vain pursuit*; cf. n. 2 on I, and n. 1 on II.

(6) This refers to the unsuccessful siege of Bethsura, a small but strongly fortified place on the boundary between Judea and Idumea, commanding the road from Jerusalem to Hebron; cf. 1 Macc. 6, 31; 2 Macc. 13, 19. The son of Antiochus Epiphanes, Antiochus V. Eupator, who was but ten years old, marched against Bethsura in 163 B. C., but his efforts were fruitless.

(7) The name of the wise defender of Bethsura has been forgotten, but the name of the traitor Rhodocus is recorded; cf. 2 Macc. 13, 21. Wellhausen, *op. cit.* (see n. 17 on IV) p. 261, n. 1 says, the Jews would have forgotten Judas Maccabæus, if the Books of the Maccabees had not been preserved by the Church.

(8) See n. 1 on I.

(9) See n. 19 on I.

(10) Study and explore.

(11) Cf. n. 15 on IV.

(12) Devices, theories, speculations.

(13) Cf. Deut. 4, 2; 12, 32; Prov. 30, 6; Rev. 22, 18, 19.

(14) Eccl. 1, 1 says: *in Jerusalem*; cf. n. 9 and II, v. 00.

(15) Imbided.

(16) Socrates' conception of wisdom was the knowledge that he knew nothing; and Dubois-Reymond said at the conclusion of his address on the *Grenzen des Naturerkennens* (delivered at Leipzig in 1872): *Ignorabimus*.

(17) Lit., beautiful in its time. Socrates was convinced that whatever the deity decrees must be good.

(18) Lit., He has put obscurity (dimness) in their heart (mind). We must read *haclem*; cf. Talm. *bē-haclem* (or *bē-calēm=bē-hē-calēm*) 'unconsciously' and *κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν κεῖται*, 2 Cor. 3, 15.

(19) Lit., far from me.

(20) Theoretically.

(21) Practical experience.

(22) Theoretical.

(23) This polemical interpolation extolling wisdom reflects the Stoic philosophy, which regarded the wise man as the impersonation of perfection.

(24) Lit., wisdom is good with an inheritance, *i. e.*, just as good as an inheritance (so AV, margin).

(25) Lit., those who see the sun. The meaning of the passage is: If a man acquires wisdom, he is as well equipped as a man who has inherited a fortune. Wisdom is even preferable to money: it ennobles life and makes it worth living. A poor wise man may be happier than a rich fool. Money may be lost, but wisdom is a treasure which moths and rust cannot consume (Matt. 6, 19; Luke 12, 33). For Schopenhauer's misapplication of this passage see n. 15 to my lecture cited in n. 2 to the Introduction; cf. n. 43 on VIII.

(26) That is, in the right (proper) place. It does not mean that the heart of the wise man beats on the right side of the body. Cf. the German phrase *das Herz auf dem rechten Fleck haben* and our *right-hearted*.

(27) According to the beliefs of the ancient Hebrews the heart is the seat of the intellect. His heart is at the right means therefore: his mind is sound (sane, rational, sensible).

(28) That is, in the wrong place. Left-hand=inauspicious; left-handed=awkward, unskilful; left-witted=dull, stupid.

(29) Lit., in the way (errand) which the fool goes. In 1 K 18, 22 *he has a way* (AV, he is in a journey) means *he has some business*; cf. also Is. 58, 13: *not doing thy own ways*=pursuing thy business; Jud. 18, 5 *our way which we go*=the errand on which we are going, *i. e.*, our undertaking.

(30) Heb. + the mouth of. Contrast the last line of II, ii.

(31) Confuse, entangle, involve in trouble. (32) Lit., better (than).

(33) Lit., are above the shout of the ruler among the fools.

(34) The fragrant ointment of the dealer in aromatic spices and perfumes; see my Book of Canticles (cf. n. 21 on the Introduction) nn. 7-10 on No. 1.

(35) That is, unfathomable.

(36) Cf. n. 1 on II. Socrates identified virtue with knowledge; he believed that no one consciously did wrong, but only through imperfect cognition. Nietzsche says, many actions are called bad which are merely stupid.

VII.

(1) Lit., what is it doing?

(2) That is, to stimulate, lit., draw, attract (lure).

(3) Lit., do; cf. Greek *ἐνπράττειν* and below, n. 25, and n. 57 on VIII.

(4) That is, limited, few; AV, margin, the number of the days, *i. e.*, the few days (cf. AV, margin, Is. 10, 19). Shakespeare says: The sands are numbered that make up my life. Cf. the German *Seine Tage sind gezählt*, also 2 Macc. 6, 25 (for Swete's *ἀκέραιον*, for MS. *ἀκαίρεον*, read, with Fritzsche, *ἀκαριαῖον*).

(5) Heb. + in them. (6) Lit., a wood sprouting (out) trees.

(7) Works accomplished, achievements. (8) What sort of a man?

(9) Forethought. Heb. + under the sun.

(10) Lit., I turned to let my heart despair. (11) If there is a man.

(12) Lit., give it, surrender it. (13) Lit., falls. (14) Lit., griefs.

(15) Lit., and his labor much worry.

(16) Lit., to make his soul see good. (17) Cf. below, gloss θ.

(18) Not only one, but plenty of them; not only one wife, but a whole harem.

(19) Cf. IV, μ; VI, γ.

(20) Lit., in darkness, even if his whole life is dreary and cheerless, destitute of joy, gladness and comfort; if he experiences nothing but unhappiness, grief, and worry.

(21) Lit., is from the hand of.

(22) Lit., who can eat, and who can feel?

(23) Lit., who is good before Him.

(24) Heb. + for them.

(25) Lit., to do well; cf. above, n. 3.

(26) Cf. 5, 19 (V, σ).

(27) Cf. 8, 13 (II, νν).

VIII.

(1) As though you were continually feasting and rejoicing; *cf.* Ps. 23, 5; Prov. 27, 9; Is. 61, 3; Luke, 7, 46. Contrast 7, 3 (III, 1).

(2) Lit., see (*i. e.*, enjoy) life. *Cf.* 2 Macc. 14, 25 (*ἐγάμησεν, εὖστάθησεν, ἐκοινώνησεν βίον*).

(3) Temporary existence, fleeting life; *cf.* II, 1.

(4) Here Ecclesiastes preaches the gospel of work; see also n. 5 on IV.

(5) Do not be too anxious about the future. You must run some risk if you want to succeed in this world. Act like a merchant who sends his grain to distant lands across the sea. Do not be timid, but cautious. Do not put all your eggs into one basket, do not ship all your goods in one bottom. Be prepared for all contingencies, for we cannot control the future.

(6) Unforeseen occurrences out of the range of ordinary calculation are liable to happen at any time; but if you do not dare to run any risk, you can accomplish nothing.

(7) Even the commonest occupations are attended with risk.

(8) Snakes abound in Palestine and are often found in dilapidated buildings the stones of which are not unfrequently used for new houses. Hillah on the Euphrates *e. g.* is built entirely with bricks from the ruins of Babylon.

(9) Lit., its wielder must put forth more strength. The risk is not so great, but then it requires a greater effort.

(10) Do not lock the stable door after the steed is stolen. All your precautions help you nothing if you miss the proper moment.

(11) You must not be over-cautious, otherwise you will never accomplish anything.

(12) Work whenever you can; *cf.* above, n. 4.

(13) These lines form the basis of the well-known German students' song *Gaudeamus igitur*, originally a penitential song of two stanzas. Stanzas ii and iii are found in a manuscript of 1267; stanzas i-iii were probably known about 1717. The tune, which is a saraband, can hardly have originated prior to 1750.

(14) Amuse yourself while you are young. Pluck those flowers of pleasure which grow alongside the path of life. Be no hermit or ascetic, but do not ruin your health! *Cf.* the German (or rather, Swiss) song: *Freut euch des Lebens, weil noch das Lämpchen glüht; pflücket die Rose, eh' sie verblüht!* (by H. G. Nägeli, of Zurich, 1793).

(15) That is, thy wife; *cf.* Prov. 5, 15-18. In modern Palestinian love-songs a girl is often termed a fountain or a well; *cf.* my *Book of Canticles* (see n. 21 on the Introduction) n. 36 on No. 8. The meaning of the passage is: Do not neglect your lawful wife! Try to build up a family while you are in the full possession of your manly vigor!

(16) The sun is the sunshine of childhood when everything seems bright and happy; the moon is symbolical of the more tempered light of boyhood and early manhood, while the stars indicate the sporadic mo-

ments of happiness in mature age. More and more the number of rainy days increases, but seldom interrupted by bright moments; and when we are going down the hill, there is no sunshine after the rain, but the clouds return, and everything seems painted gray on gray.

(17) The hands.

(18) The bones, especially the backbone.

(19) The teeth.

(20) The eyes begin to lose their luster, and sight becomes dim.

(21) Lit., the doors toward the street are closed, *i. e.*, the exits are barred: secretions are insufficient, or vitiated, or cease; he begins to suffer from retention (*ischuria*) and intestinal stenosis.

(22) His digestion is impaired.

(23) His sleep is short; he awakens when the birds begin to chirp at daybreak.

(24) He is unable to hear sounds distinctly, and becomes hard of hearing.

(25) He hates to climb a hill, or to go upstairs, because he is short of breath.

(26) Lit., fears are on the way, *i. e.*, he dreads a walk even on level ground.

(27) His hair turns hoary. Dr. Post, of Beirut, says of the blossoms of the almond tree: Although the petals are pale pink toward the base, they are usually whitish toward their tips, and the general effect of an almond tree in blossom is white. Bodenstedt in his *Tausend und ein Tag im Orient* (2, 237) speaks of the white blossoms of the almond tree as falling down like snow-flakes.

(28) Lit., becomes a burden.

(29) The Heb. term is generally used for locusts in one of their stages of development. It may have been loosely applied to many kinds of insects, just as *bug* is sometimes used here in America.

(30) Lit., the poor one. In the same way we read in Ps. 22, 21:

From the jaws of the lion save me,
my wretched (life) from the unicorns.

Cf. Wellhausen's translation in the Polychrome Bible.

(31) Lit., breaks through. The soul is freed from the body, as the butterfly emerges from the chrysalis. The Greek word *psyche* means not only soul but also butterfly.

(32) The spinal chord.

(33) The brain.

(34) The heart loses its power to propel the blood through the body.

(35) The waterwheel, *i. e.*, the whole machinery comes to a stop (*paralysis cordis*) and this stoppage means dissolution.

(36) The grave.

(37) The hired mourners (*qui conducti plorant in funere*, Hor., *Ars poet.* 431).

(38) Lit., before them. *Cf.* IV, μ .

(39) In 1 Macc. 3, 56 we read that when Judas Maccabæus (165-161) organized his army, he discharged all men who were building houses, or were planting vineyards, or were fearful (*cf.* Deut. 24, 5 and the late

Deuteronomistic addition, Deut. 20, 5-8) but at the time of the author of the present gloss there were no exemptions in time of war; John Hyrcanus (135-104) and his successors had no national Jewish army, but mercenaries (Joseph., *Ant.*, xiii, 8, 4). The soldiers of Alexander Jannæus (see n. 12 on the Introduction) were Pisidians and Cilicians. In the army of Herod the Great (37-4 B. C.) there were numerous Thracians, Germans, and Gauls (Joseph., *Ant.*, xv, 8, 4).

The meaning of the present passage is: Just as no one can avert the wind, so no one can avert his death-day. There is no exemption, just as there is no discharge from the ranks, no furlough in time of war. Even the righteous must yield to the inexorable law of death, and wickedness will certainly not exempt those who are given to it, for the wages of sin is death (Rom. 6, 23).

(40) Cf. 2 Macc. 7, 22.

(41) According to Winckler this may be an allusion to Alcimus who commanded that the inner court of the sanctuary should be pulled down (1 Macc. 9, 54); see, however, n. 3 on the Introduction.

(42) Do what you feel inclined to, and enjoy what pleases your eye. This ironical addition is based on Num. 15, 39.

(43) This passage is an interpolation. Ecclesiastes was no misogynist; cf. stanzas ii and x of section VIII (9, 9; 12, 1). Schopenhauer, who quotes Ecclesiastes twelve times, remarks: *Der geniale Koheleth sagt: "Unter Tausend habe ich einen Menschen gefunden, aber kein Weib unter allen diesen;"* but three of the seven passages of Ecclesiastes, which Schopenhauer quotes, are interpolations, viz., 7, 4 (III, 4) quoted in Schopenhauer's works, vol. 3, p. 731; 5, 78;—7, 12 (VI, 0) quoted 5, 352; 6, 462;—7, 29 (VIII, v) quoted 4, 32. See Schopenhauer's *Werke* edited by J. Frauenstädt, and W. L. Hertslet's *Schopenhauer-Register* (Leipzig, 1890) p. 22; see also above, n. 25 on VI.

(44) Examining and counting one case after the other, making a statistical investigation.

(45) Lit., calculation (ratio, proportion).

(46) Diogenes is reported to have gone to the market place, with a lighted lantern in broad daylight, to find men. Napoleon I. said to Goethe: *Vous êtes un homme.*

(47) That is, an ideal woman.

(48) Lit., spirit; cf. n. 2 on IV.

(49) Cf. nn. 1. 19 on I.

(50) More exactly, double-hemistichs, hemistichal pairs; each line in Heb. poetry consists of a pair of hemistichs (with 3+3, 2+2, or 3+2 beats).

(51) Graceful, elegant. (52) He never sacrificed substance to form.

(53) Lit., lords (members) of the assembly, i. e., parts of a collection, lines forming parts of a coherent poem, not isolated apothegms or detached aphorisms. An isolated maxim, a single proverb, as we find them in the Book of Proverbs, which was commonly ascribed to Solomon, is like the point of an ox-goad: it pricks one particular spot for a moment, urging on and stimulating, but has no lasting effect. Sayings, however, which are systematically arranged in a special collection form-

iug a coherent didactic poem, are as impressive as nails firmly driven into a board: they have a firm hold on us. This is said also with reference to the relative difficulty of memorizing isolated sayings as contained in the Book of Proverbs, on the one hand, and the coherent didactic poem of Ecclesiastes, on the other. It is much harder to learn the Book of Proverbs by heart (owing to the lack of connection between the individual verses) than the Book of Ecclesiastes which is written by one shepherd (or leader) on a definite plan and with a definite object in view.

(54) Of Epicurus and his followers.

(55) On Greek philosophy. The Greek philosophers were very prolific writers. Cf. M. Friedländer, *Griechische Philosophie im Alten Testament* (Berlin, 1904) and E. Sellin *Die Spuren griechischer Philosophie im Alten Testament* (Leipzig, 1905).

(56) Schopenhauer says, Much reading deprives the mind of all elasticity; it is like keeping a spring perpetually under pressure (quoted by Dr. James Moffat in his Literary Illustrations of Ecclesiastes in *The Expositor*, Jan. 1905, p. 79) cf. J. Frauenstädt's *Schopenhauer-Lexicon* (Leipzig, 1871) p. 57 and W. L. Hertslet's *Schopenhauer-Register* (Leipzig, 1890) p. 127.

(57) This is supposed to be a Grecism, = τοῦτο παντὸς ἀνθρώπου (ἐστὶν ἔργον); cf. n. 10 on V; n. 3 on VII. LXX, however, renders: ὅτι τοῦτο πᾶς ὁ ἀνθρώπος.

(58) Cf. 2 Macc. 12, 41.

(59) Viz., the snares, nets, and fetters, and other pitfalls.

(60) Lit., shepherd.

ABBREVIATIONS.

AV = Authorized Version; —c. = chapter, cc. = chapters; —EB = Cheyne-Black's *Encyclopædia Biblica* (New York, 1899-1903); —JAOS = *Journal of the American Oriental Society*; —K = The Books of The Kings; —l. = line, ll. = lines; —n. = note, nn. = notes; —p. = page, pp. = pages; —v. = verse, vv. = verses; —ZAT = Stade's *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*; —ZDMG = *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*.

In the translations from the Hebrew, parentheses, (), indicate words implied, but not expressed, in the Hebrew, or words supplied for the sake of the rhythm. Brackets, [], on the other hand, indicate words or clauses which must be restored in the Hebrew text. In the translation of Ps. 45 (see n. 9 on III) braces, { }, indicate transpositions, the traditional position of the words in the Received Text being marked by { }, while the transposed words are enclosed in { }. Similarly (§) and [?] indicate transpositions of glosses.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

PAUL HAUPT.

II.—A SEMANTIC STUDY OF THE INDO-IRANIAN NASAL VERBS.¹

PART II.

I. The *-nā*- class verbs.²

K. Verbs meaning 'caedere, scindere', etc. (= p., B, above).

1) Skr. *dṛṇāti* 'splits': *n*-flexion in Gothic *af-taurnan* 'to break off, cease'.³

For their semantic interest note

δέρι 'flays'

δέριον 'caul, net z haut'

δέριον 'skin, hide'

Goth. *ga-tafran* 'to destroy'

Germ. *zehren* 'to eat (and drink)'

2) *lunāti/lunōti* 'cuts': *n*-flexion in Goth. *fra-lusnan* (intrans.) 'to be lost'. I divide *lu-snan*, *sn* belonging to s)NĒ(y)- 'to cut'; but the division *-lus-nan* is attested for the Gothic popular feeling by *fra-lius-an*.

Base LĒ(y)-/LŌ(w)- (see d. above and nos. 23, M., 26, 141, 166).

Lat. *li-ra* 'ridge, furrow'

li-tus 'shore'⁵

li-tera 'scratch, letter'.

lō-rum 'lash'

lū-ra 'strap'

lēv-is 'smooth'

(?) *lō-mentum* 'powder'

Skr. *lēkhā* 'tear'

λη-υός 'trough'

ληίς 'booty'

Skr. *lāvas* 'cutting'

λαύρα 'ravine, cut'

Skr. *lavandm* 'salt'

¹ See A. J. P. XXV p. 369 foll.

² The classification of these verbs by meaning will not accord in all respects with the semantic grouping essayed under p., above (part I, p. 379), but this lack of symmetry will be remedied by cross references.

³ Except in cases of special semantic interest only one flexional example will be cited from the Indo-Iranian group.

⁴ I am citing 3^d sg. presents even where that particular form is not attested, generally when the flexional type is attested by other forms, but sometimes merely on native learned and lexical authority. The actual forms in use may all be controlled by Keller's lists.

⁵ Cf. Skeat's Concise Etymological Dictionary of the English Language, s. v.

Of semantic import:¹

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| λύει 'looses' | O. N. <i>lyja</i> 'to knock, beat' |
| λούει 'washes' | Goth. <i>fra-liusan</i> 'to lose' |
| Lat. <i>lavit</i> 'washes' (See M. below, and no. 23) | |

3) *kuṣṇāti* 'tears': no *n*-flexion. Originally *s)ku-ṣṇāti* (cf. no. 19), subsequently *kuṣ-ṇāti* (cf. *kuṣāti*), see on Goth. *-lusnan/-liusan* in no. 2.

Cognates (cf. no. 1):

| | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Lat. <i>cutis</i> 'skin' | <i>scūtum</i> 'shield' |
| κύτος " | σκούτος 'hide' |

4) *mṛdṇāti* 'rubs, crushes': no *n*-flexion.

Cognates with R.

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| σμερδαλέος 'frightful' | Eng. <i>smart</i> |
| σμερδνός " | Lat. <i>merda</i> 'dung'.² |

Cognates with L.

| | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| Skr. <i>mṛdūs</i> 'soft' | ἀμαλδύνει 'crushes, softens' |
| ἀμαλός " (without -D-). | |
| μαλθακός " (with -DH-) | Skr. <i>mṛdṇāti</i> 'neglects, forgets' (cf. <i>temnit</i>) |

5) *mṛṇāti* 'crushes': *n*-flexion in *μάρναται*; also cf. *mṛnāti* (with -NO-/-NE-, see q., above).

Cognates with R.

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| μαραίνει 'rubs out, quenches' | μαραίνεται 'dies' |
| Skr. <i>maradyati</i> 'destroys' | Skr. <i>mṛate</i> " |
| Av. <i>mərəncaite</i> " | Lat. <i>mortuus</i> ('tot-) geschlagen' |
| Lat. <i>marcet</i> 'droops, languishes' | <i>murcus</i> 'short' |
| Skr. <i>mṛṇālam</i> 'edible lotus' (so Uhlenbeck). | |

Cognates with L.

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Lat. <i>molat</i> 'grinds'³ | Arm. <i>malem</i> 'zerstosse, -malme' |
| <i>mulcet</i> 'strokes, soothes' | Skr. <i>mṛṣṭi</i> 'touches'⁴ |
| <i>mulcat</i> 'beats' | μαλακός 'soft'⁵ |

¹ Note German *los-bindet* 'loose-binds' = unlooses; Eng. *breaks loose*.

² Fr. *ordure* 'dung', derived from Lat. *horridum* 'frightful' justifies *merda* 'dung': σμερδνός 'frightful'.

³ Cf. Germ. *stöszer* 'pestle', *stösst* 'grinds, pulverizes'; primitive sense 'tundit'.

⁴ Cf. Germ. *sie stossen an einander* 'they touch' and Eng. *strikes* (= touches) a piano key.

⁵ Hesychius glosses φλᾶν 'to crush' by μαλάσσειν πλῆγαις; μαλαχθεῖς = 'crushed'.

6) *vlīnāti* 'crushes, squeezes': NO-/NE-flexion in Lat. *vellit* 'plucks, pulls' (see no. 51.); *vlī-* is derived from the dissyllabic base WELĀV-.¹

7) *ḡrñāti* 'crushes': *n*-flexion in O. Ir. *ar-a-chrinim* 'difficiscor' (: *do-ro-chair* 'cecidit'); see no. 29.

Of semantic import, Lat. *caries* 'decay': Skr. *ḡrñás* 'rotten'; on *κοπέωνται* see Q., below.

8) *bhrīnāti* 'wounds, injures':² no *n*-forms; *bhrī* from a base BHERaY-. Cognates:

| | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Av. <i>brā-θra</i> 'axe' | <i>φάπει</i> 'splits' | Lat. <i>ferit</i> 'strikes' |
| O. Ir. <i>berraim</i> 'tondeo' | Lat. <i>forat</i> 'pierces' | O. N. <i>berja</i> 'to beat' |
| O. B. <i>briti</i> 'tondere' | O. B. <i>brati</i> 'pugnare' | |

9) *jīnāti* 'overpowers': *n*-flexion in *βίπει* 'violat, stuprat', which is a -NĒ(Y)-suffix verb with thematic flexion (cf. Keller, l. c. p. 196, 1 c.) The base G^wINĒ(Y)- exhibits the variation *i/i* seen in *vlīnāti* (no. 6), or else *i* in *βίπει* develops as compensative lengthening from *βῖ-σνγ_γει (cf. no. 2).

Cognates: Lith. *į-gyjū* 'I acquire, gain'³

10) *kṣīnāti/kṣinóti* 'destroys': NE/NO-flexion in *φθίπει*, (? for *φθι-σν_γει, cf. no. 2) 'wastes away' (for the sense, see nos. 5, 63); cf. also *κρίννται* 'destroys' (P.). Further see nos. 174, 175.

11) *kṛñāti* (Dhātupāṭha) 'injures, kills', Av. *kərənaoiti* 'cuts', NE/NO-flexion in *cernit*, *κρίνει* (? for *κρῖ-σν_γει, or like *vlīnāti*, no. 9) 'scheidet, sichtet, sondert; unterscheidet'.

Base S)KER-

κείπει shears⁴

O. N. *skera* 'caedere'

¹ In this paper *a* is the transcription for *a** or *a**.

² Whitney defines by 'consumes'.

³ From a more primitive 'strike, hit' (cf. P. below)? But if Skr. *jyā* 'violence' and *jyā* 'bow-string' are cognate, *į-gyjū* may have meant something like '*ich packe*' (= I tie up and carry off for myself). Even so, the sinew-thread of the primitive bow was got by cutting, not by weaving, and thus the base G^wYĒ- may have had a primitive sense 'to cut' (see nos. 39, 63).

⁴ It is customary to derive *κείπει* from KĒRYETI and *κουρεύς* 'cutter, barber' from *κορF-* or *κορσ-*. It is not impossible but the base was K^wĒ(Y)-R- / K^wŌ(W)-R-, an *r*-extension of a base to be subsequently discussed (no. 119). Sabine *curis* 'hasta' would derive from KŌ(W)-R-, *quiris* (?) from K^wĒ(Y)-R- cf. *κῆπει* 'strikes, hits', *κώρυκος* 'leathern bag' (cf. Skr. *ḡṛtis*, same meaning: *ḡṛpei* 'splits, flays'). On the guttural variation in this root, see below in this number. The type of base represented by KĒ(Y)-R- gives rise to participles of the type KĪR-NŌS, cf., e. g., Skr. *ḡrñds* 'rotten': Lat. *caries* 'rot' (no. 7). The base S)KĒY-R- is attested by *κίρννμι* 'I mix', no. 29., (cf. Skr. *kirdti* 'scatters', with K), as the base SKHĒY-D- is attested by *σκίδννμι* 'I scatter' (cf. no. 119).

Of semantic interest:

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Du. <i>schorten</i> 'to lack' (= to fall short) | O. Ir. <i>cruth</i> 'forma' |
| Base s)KEL- Lith. <i>skeliū</i> 'scindo' | O. B. <i>kolja</i> 'caedo' |
| Lat. <i>culler</i> 'knife' | <i>celer</i> 'swift' (see R.) |

Of semantic interest:

| | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| O. Ir. <i>scailim</i> 'σκεῖδ ἄννυμι' | Skr. <i>kirdti</i> 'scatters, pours' |
| Skr. <i>kalā</i> 'part' | <i>kdlis</i> 'division, quarrel'— 'ace' (dice) |
| <i>κηλῖς</i> 'spot' | Lat. <i>cālidus</i> (ā from ē?) 'spotted' |
| Skr. <i>kalāṇkas</i> " | <i>cāligo</i> 'mist' |
| " <i>kdluṇas</i> 'dirty' (cf. no. 7) | O. B. <i>kalā</i> 'dung' (cf. Kluge, s. v. <i>scheissen</i>) |

Base SKER-P-

| | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Skr. <i>kṛpāṇas</i> 'sword' | κρόπιον 'sickle' | Lith. <i>kėrpū</i> 'tondeo' |
| Lat. <i>carpit</i> 'plucks' | καρπός 'crop' | |

Of semantic interest:

| | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Lat. <i>corpus</i> 'body' | Skr. <i>kṛp-</i> 'forma'? |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|

Base s)KEL-P-

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Skr. <i>kḍipate</i> 'arranges' | Lat. <i>scalpit</i> 'scratches' |
| Lat. <i>sculpat</i> 'graves' | <i>culpa</i> 'fault, crack, gebrechen' |

We can hardly escape the question whether Skr. *kṛnōti* 'makes' is a cognate, with specialized sense, of *kṛnāti*; cf. Lith. *kuriū* 'I build'.⁵ We may compare Eng. *shapes*, Germ. *schafft*: Lith. *skabėti* 'cuts', Lat. *scabit* 'scrapes' (so Skeat); while Lat. *figit* 'shapes, fashions, moulds' is an ultimate doublet, I take it, of *figit* 'pierces, sticks, fastens'.⁶ On Lat. *parat* 'procures, produces, makes' (: *peipet* 'cuts') see Am. Jr. Phil., 25, 182.

¹ Not from **culptro-* as I suggested in Am. Jr. Phil. 24, 73, nor from *kertro-* (Skutsch, B. B. 22, 126).

² So Eng. *crop* (noun) from *to crop*, see Skeat, l. c., s. v.

³ Cf. *forma* 'shape': *forat* 'pierces' (?).

⁴ Cf. Skr. *chidra-* 'hole, defect': *√chid-* 'scindere', Eng. *blemish*: O. Fr. *blesmir* 'wound' (see Skeat, l. c.). See Am. Jr. Phil. l. c. p. 73.

⁵ Uhlenbeck (Etym. Woert. d. ai. Sprache), in view of Cymric *peri* 'machen', writes a labialized velar for *kṛnōti*; Brugmann (Gr. I² § 631, 641) writes for it and for *kṛnāti* a pure velar. Cf. also *ḥṛnāti* (no. 7). See v. below.

⁶ The roots are DHEYĠH- 'to mould' and DHEYĠW- 'to stick' (cf. Lith. *dėgti* 'to smart', *dėgūs* 'pricking'). On the variation of *gh* and *gw* see j. above and cf. *thygánei* 'touches' (see no. 5 for a parallel semantic relation); also see v. below. The Latin doublet *figit*/*fiuit*, as well as Av. *daesayeiti* 'heaps up':

12) *mināti* / *minōti* 'damages, lessens; gets lost': *nu*-flexion well attested, Gr. *μνύθει*, Lat. *minuit* 'lessens'. Original sense 'caedit'. Cognates:

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Lat. <i>dim-minuit</i> 'splits open' | <i>minat</i> 'agit' (Festus) ¹ |
| <i>minatur</i> 'threatens' | <i>minor</i> 'smaller' ² |
| O. N. <i>mei-ða</i> 'nocere' | Skr. <i>mē-th-ati</i> 'offendit' |

Of semantic interest:

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Lat. <i>mutat</i> 'swaps' ³ (from * <i>moitat</i>) | Av. <i>mae-θ-</i> 'to cheat' ⁴ |
| Skr. <i>māy-ā</i> 'decoy' ⁵ | |

The relation of meaning between *mināti* ('breaks,') injures' and *minōti* 'walls, builds' (no. 91) does not differ from the relation of *kṛnāti*/*kṛnōti*, discussed in the last number (see especially the last fn.). Note

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| Lettic <i>mē-t-s</i> 'stake' | O. N. <i>meiðr</i> 'stake' |
| Skr. <i>me-th-ís</i> / <i>me-dh-ís</i> 'stake, tree, pillar' | Lat. <i>moē-nia</i> / <i>mū-ri</i> 'walls' (see no. 29) |

Skr. *dēghāhi* 'smears' (cf. Uhlenbeck, s. v. *dehas*), attest the variation *gh*/*gw*(*h*) and so perhaps does *τεῖχος* 'teich' (cf. Kluge, s. v.): *τεῖχος* 'wall, dike' (cf. *πηλός* 'mud', Lat. *pālus* 'swamp': *pālus* 'stake'). Whether the original meaning of the group was 'to stick clay together' or 'to stick timbers together with pegs' is unessential. It is a question for the historian to determine whether the first *τεῖχος* was a 'stockade' or a 'dike'. It may very well have been both at once, and one "cuts a ditch" (doublet of dike = 'trench and embankment') as one cuts stakes for a stockade. Whether the mason or the joiner preceded in time, the terms of the one craft were liable to adoption by the other: cf. Eng. *wall*—made by the mason—from Lat. *vallum* 'stockade' (: *vallus* 'stake')—made by the joiner (see also no. 52). On the cognate base *DHĒ*(*v*)- see no. 54.

¹The sense is rather 'verberat', cf. Apuleius, the archaizer, Met. III. 27 *asinum . . . minantes baculis exigunt*.

²Cf. Skr. *kṣudrds* 'small': *kṣṛdati* 'beats'

³The colloquial verb *swaps* originally meant 'cuts (wheat) by chopping instead of reaping, strikes, beats' (so The Standard Dictionary and Skeat, l. c.). An essential part of the bargain seems to have been some form of blow,—*schlag*, *gegenschlag*, *durchschlag* (see Meringer, l. c. pp. 170-171),—cf. our 'to strike a trade' and *schlag* = 'festgesetzter Preis'.

⁴For the sense of 'cheats' cf. *κάπηλος* (1) 'trader', (2) 'cheat, rogue'; Lat. *ferit*, *per-cutit*, Eng. *beats* and *strikes* all come to mean 'cheats' in one sphere or another.

⁵Cf. *δόλος* 'trick': *√DEL* 'to split'; perhaps, *frau-d-* 'dolos': *frus-tum* (from **frud-tom*) 'bit' (= 'gespaltenes'); Germ. *schlag* ('bird-) trap': *schlägt* 'caedit'; *scheide* 'snare'.

The common base of all these words was $\text{M}\ddot{\text{E}}(\text{Y})$ - 'to cut, stick, thrust'.¹ Further cognates:

Lat. *me-t-it* 'reaps'² *mē-ti-tur* 'measures'³
μαῖα 'midwife' (= die entbin derin) O. B. *mi-ně-ti* 'putare' (see no. 25)⁴

Base $\text{SM}\ddot{\text{E}}(\text{Y})$ -, $\text{SM}\ddot{\text{E}}(\text{Y})$ -K-

σμί-λη 'chisel' *σμενύη* 'hoe'
σμικ-ρός 'small' (cf. *minor* above) *σμί-λαξ* 'yew' (cf. Lat. *taxus*⁵ no. 85)
 (?) *Σμι-ν-θεύς* 'smiter' (?) *σμί-ν-θος* 'mouse' (if = 'biter', cf. no. 38)
 Lat. *mū-c-ro* (? : $\text{SM}\ddot{\text{O}}(\text{Y})$ -K- or $\text{SM}\ddot{\text{O}}(\text{W})$ -K-) 'point'
ē-minet 'sticks out' *prō-minet* 'sticks forward'⁶
μέ-τ-αλλον 'fodina'⁷ *manet* 'remains'⁸

13) *kliḡ-nāti* 'tortures': no *n*-forms. Uhlenbeck suggests that *sam* + $\sqrt{\text{kliḡ}}$ 'to crush, squeeze' adumbrates the primitive meaning and hesitatingly compares Czech *klestiti* 'to hew, cut'. Add Lat. *clingit* 'cludit' (if = *zuschlägt*) and the gloss *clinsit* (? = *clinxit*) 'decurtavit'.

L. (= A). To bind, fasten, splice, etc.

It was noted in m. above how contrasting meanings had developed in *stick* > *stitch*, Germ. *stechen* > *stecken*.⁹ A similar contrasting pair is found in *split* > *splice*, and like contrasts have developed in many other words describing mechanical processes, e. g.:

Lat. *stringit* 'strips' > 'binds' (cf. *strix* 'groove, striga' 'swath'), *ligat* 'binds' > *ligo* 'grub-axe', Skr. *kṛntāti* 'cuts' > *kṛṇātti* 'spins',¹⁰ twists', *āpis* 'auger' > *āpāpiskei*

¹ Cf. Skr. *mīmāti mīmīte* (with *mī*- from *māy*). The roots in $\text{-}\ddot{\text{E}}(\text{Y})$ - may have been the source of the reduplication type in *i*.

² Cf. *swaps*, above.

³ (1) 'measures, estimates, judges'; (2) 'steps, paces, traverses'. The sense 'measures' is generalized, perhaps from 'distributes' (e. g. *frumentum militibus metitur*), but cf. Eng. *strike* = 'a leveller for measuring corn', Germ. *getreide einschlagen* = 'frumentum metiri'.

⁴ With *-ně-* from $\text{-N}\ddot{\text{E}}(\text{Y})$ -

⁵ Cf. Schrader, l. c. s. v. Eibe.

⁶ A semantic parallel in O. E. *scorian* 'to project, jut out', which belongs with SKER- 'to cut, stick' (no. 11). The *nē* of *-minēre* corresponds with the *nē* of Lith. *grabinėti* (see q. above).

⁷ For the suffix cf. *κρύσ-τ-αλλος* 'ice'.

⁸ Cf. Goth. *beidan* (no. 14), Germ. *bleibt* (no. 167).

⁹ Cf. the Slavic bases 1 *tūk*- 'weben' > 2 *tūk*- 'einstecken, stechen'.

¹⁰ Cf. *κροτεῖ* 'smites': *κε-κροτημένος* 'close woven' (Lid. and Scott, s. v. II. 5), from the process of "striking the warp home".

'joins, fastens,' Eng. *botch* = Du. *butsen* 'strike' > < 'patch up', Ital. *piccare* 'to pierce' > < *ap-picare* 'to hang up, fasten together', Lat. *mordet* 'bites' > < 'grips' (Seneca), Eng. *swaddles* 'beats (?)' > < 'wraps', πάσσαλος 'peg' > < Skr. *pāṣas* 'rope', Lat. *pangit* 'figit, pegs' > < παγίς, πάγη 'noose, trap' (see no. 168), Little Russ. *stebnuty* 'caedere' > < 'nere', δαίεται 'shares' > < δίδησι 'binds'.¹ With prepositions, Skr. *sam-hanti* 'joins, unites' > < 'breaks', Germ. *anstösst* 'makes touch, unite' > < *stösst* 'strikes, thrusts'.

Other locutions generally illustrative of the notion 'to split' > < 'splice' are German "bretter zusammenstossen", "haare in einen knoten schlagen", "das tuch über dem kopf schlagen", "papier um ein paket schlagen", "zu Faden schlagen" = 1) 'ordiri', 2) 'to baste', 3) 'to twist (rope)'; Eng. *nails* 'to fasten with nails'; *tacks*, 1) 'to fasten with tacks', 2) 'to baste, sew' (cf., with generalized sense of 'to fasten', at-tach, de-tach); "to batten (down)" = 'to fasten (down) with battens' (batons),

¹ It is customary, because of δᾶμος 'schar, district, folk', to write the base of δαίεται as DĀ(Y)-, but I write it as DĒ(Y) because of δεῖ-π-νον 'feast' (: δαίνουσι 'feasts', Skr. *dā-p-ayati* 'shares', cf. Prellwitz, Woert. s. v. *δαπάνη*), regarding ā in δᾶμος as secondarily lengthened ē. The base of δίδησι 'binds', generally written DĒ, ought also to be written DĒ(Y), cf. Skr. *dī-sva* (impv.) ptc. *dī-nas*, defined by Uhlenbeck 'nieder geschlagen', ('vinctus'), *chēlif* (= Lat. *captivum*), *dy-dti* 'cuts' (like *chy-dti* 'cuts', from SKHĒ(Y)-, so Prellwitz, s. v. *σχάζω*); Homeric *dōgon* 'caedebant', though obscure in its morphology, also belongs here, probably; *divei* 'whirls, (twists), spins round': Aeolic *δίννα* (? from **di-sva*) 'vortex' correspond semantically with Lat. *vertit* 'turns': *verticillus* 'spindle', that is, if the verb be defined by 'spins'. Availing ourselves of Lat. *omentum* (1) 'caul' (2) 'fat', we may derive *δημός* 'fat' from DĒ(Y)- 'to cut', cf. *δέπτρον* 'caul': *δέπει* ('cuts, flays'). If Lat. *con-dire* meant originally 'to tie together (bunches of herbs)', we see from Germ. *wilruen* how it may have developed the sense 'to preserve, spice, pickle', cf. Gr. *ἀρνύει* 'seasons', a specialized derivative of *ἀρπίζειν* 'joins'. Beside the base DĒ(Y)- 'to cut, divide, share' stood DŌ(W)- (cf. O. Lat. *du-il*, Gr. *δοF-έναι*, Skr. *dāv-dne*) 'to give, bescheren', a generalization of meaning as in *schenkt* 'gives': *schenkt* 'pours in'. The allocation of the generalized meaning 'to give' to the base DŌ(W)- (not DŌ-, cf. Meillet, *Introd. Étud. Compar. Lang. Ind.-Eur.* p. 75) is an interesting semantic phenomenon. To DŌ(W)- 'to bind' we may refer *δοῦλος*, *δῶλος* 'bond man', *δόναξ/δοῦναξ/δῶναξ* 'reed, arrow', *in-du-tiae* 'foedus' (see no. 14); while Goth. *tēwi* 'schar von fünfzig mann' may be derived from DĒ(W)- 'to cut' > < 'bind'. From DĒ(Y)-/DŌ(W)- 'to cut' we may derive Goth. *tau-jan* 'to make' (see no. 11 on *kerhōti*), with a more original sense in O. Eng. *tāwian* 'to tan, dēfein' (see no. 87).

a locution comparable with Lat. *claudit* 'closes' (: *clāva* 'club', *clāvis* 'key', *clāvus* 'peg').

14) Skr. *badhnāti* 'binds': *n*-flexion in Goth. *and-bundnan* 'to be loosed'.

It is customary to write the base as BHENDH- with permanent *n*,¹ but cf. O. Ir. *co-beden con-bodlas*,² *buden*, 'army', O. Brit. *bodin* 'manus', plur. *bodinion* 'phalanges'. Add O. Ir. *bodar* (: Skr. *badhirās*) 'deaf', supposing the original sense to have been 'deaf-and-dumb' as in *ἐνέος* (if = "tongue-tied", see above A. a.), cf. Goth. *baups*, *κωφός* 'deaf, dumb';³ (?) Lat. *surdus* 'deaf': *serit* binds, *sera* 'fastener, bar' (cf. *absurdus* glossed by *ἀν-ἀρμωστος* 'dis-cordant'). In view, however, of the *b*- of Skr. *badvam* 'troop, army', and the uncertainty of the definition of *badhirās* as ['dumb], deaf', the argument for permanent *n* is the stronger. But if we study our root in the sense 'to split' < splice' the argument against the permanence of *n* is conclusive:

| | |
|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Lith. <i>bedą</i> 'I dig' | Lat. <i>fodit</i> 'digs' |
| Lith. <i>badų-ti</i> 'fodicare' | O. B. <i>bodą</i> 'fodico' |
| Cymric <i>bedd</i> 'fossa' ⁵ | |

Other words of cognate meaning attest a base BHĒ(Y)DH- 'to split > < splice', viz.:

| | |
|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Lat. <i>fōdit</i> (pf.) | Skr. <i>bādhate</i> 'constrains' (: Ital. <i>costringere</i> 'draw tight with cords') |
| <i>fībula</i> 'buckle' | O. B. <i>bēditi</i> } |
| (?) <i>fīb-ra</i> 'division, entrails' | Goth. <i>baidjan</i> } 'costringere' |

¹ The syllable *-bund-* of *and-bund-nan* is supposed to be final proof of *n* in *badhnāti*, but it is only final proof of *n* in *and-bund-nan*, and even here *n* is not necessarily primary, but may have been introduced from the pret., *-bundum*. That we should expect a weak syllable before accented *nā* is true, but the intrusion of the *ē* grade on the zero grade, attested by a participle form like *πεντός*, is also attested for the nasal verbs of the Indo-Iranian group (cf. Keller, l. c. § 16), and we have no means of demonstrating that in the pro-ethnic stage the same intrusion did not take place.

² Verifiable by me only in the lexica of Prellwitz, s. v. *πείσμα* and Fick's Woerterbuch, I⁴, p. 90.

³ *κωφός* 'maimed': *σκάφος* 'pit', Lith. *skabėti* 'to cut'.

⁴ Pace Brugmann Gr. I³ § 166.

⁵ Stokes in Fick's Woert.⁴ II p. 166.

It is hard to decide whether Lat. *foedus* 'truce' comes from the sense 'to join' or the sense 'to strike' (see no. 12 above, and cf. *foedus ferire* 'to strike a truce'). So *παγείς* in *ὄρκος παγείς* 'a sure and steadfast oath' may be derived either from the primitive sense of 'fasten' or '(fest-)stecken' (cf. Menge's Woert. s. v. *πήγνυμι*¹). Whether the explanation of *ferire* in the locution *foedus ferire* is as simple as the German word *schlag* suggests (see no. 12 fn. 3) is uncertain to my mind. Some form of ascertaining genuineness by tapping (striking), as in the Greek locution *κέραμον κρούειν*, may have underlain the contract making, or some breaking of a tessera hospitalis may have been the chief symbolic act of a treaty-making, cf. Gr. *ὄρκια πιστὰ ταμεῖν* which lends itself to the interpretation 'symbola <pactionis> fissi-facere' as well as to 'foederis causa <hostiam> caedere', though the cutting up of the animal sacrificed for distribution among the treaty makers was certainly a part of the ceremonial (cf. Aristophanes, *Lysis*. 192).²

Lat. *fidus* we may interpret by (1) *παγείς*, (?) *ve-rus* ('true, reliable': *wēy-* 'to plait') or (2) by ('split, open, frank, loyal', cf. Il. 15. 26 *πεπιθοῦσα θυέλλας* 'procellas findendo resolvens'.³ Illustrating the latter definition, at least roughly, stand the glosses *certus sum* 'πέπεισμαι, persuasus sum', *certus* 'fidelis', *fidus* 'amicus fidelis, certus', — *certus*: *SKER-* 'to cut' (no. 11) = *fidus*: *BHĒY-D(H)-* 'to split'. Further, the relation of *BHĒY-D(H)-* to *BHENDH-* 'to bind, bend' (see T., β.,) enables us to define *πείθει* by 'flectit, κάμπτει' (cf. the gloss *flectit* 'persuadet'). Or did *fidus πιστός* mean 'tried, tested by splitting', cf. *fidiculae* 'genus tormentorum, sunt ungulae (l. *unculae*?) quibus torquentur <rei> in eculeo (= rack) adpensi'.

Further cognates of semantic interest are:

φιδίτιον 'δαίς' *πιθάκνη/φιδάκνη* 'fidelia'⁴

¹ Cf. *pignus* 'pledge, earnest of a bargain', which seems an ultimate cognate; see the root discussed in no. 168.

² Lat. *foedus* 'ugly' meant either (1) 'scarred, cut' or implied (2) 'sourness' of face, (cf. Eng. *bitter*: *√BHĒ(Y)-D* 'to split, bite'). From *foedat* 'mutilates' I judge the former to be the more probable interpretation.

³ Cf. Skr. *dāna-bhīnnaś* 'bestochen, bribed' with *μισθῶ πείθειν*.

⁴ We may suppose the earthen pot to have followed the plaited water-basket as it demonstrably did in North American civilization (cf. Mason's *Woman's Share in Primitive Culture*, pg. 97). Eng. *cask* derives ultimately from *quassare* 'to break, burst' (see Skeat, l. c.), cf. *dolium* 'cask': *√DEL* (in no. 1). Unless indeed the original cast was a 'hollowed log', a 'trough' (*ληνός*, no. 2).

An additional base belonging in this group is BHENEDH- which perhaps appears with the sense 'to split' in Lat. *fenestra* 'cut, hole, window' (cf. on the semantic question Meringer, l. c., p. 126), from BHENEDH-TRĀ. I derive BHENEDH from BHĒ(Y)- + NĒDH-, as in c. above, though NĒDH- is attested only in the sense 'to splice' (see A. γ. above).¹ The grade BHENDH- is, barring *fenestra*, the grade in evidence. The relation of BHENDH- to BHĒ(Y)DH- has parallels in Goth. *fra-slinda* (base SLINDH- or SLENDH-): O. B. *slēdū* (base SLĒYDH-), Lith. *sprindis* (base SPRIND-): O. Ir. *srēdim* (base SPRĒ(Y)D-), cf. Reichelt KZ. 39 p. 75-6.

Only bare traces exist of the mutation BHŌ(W)-DH-, at least with transparent associations of meaning, and Goth. *baups* 'dumb, deaf': Skr. *badhīrās* 'deaf' (see above in this no.) has had its *au* explained by analogy with *daufs* 'deaf'. Skr. *budhnā-* 'bottom' may be a straggler, primarily meaning 'pavimentum, battuto',² cf. *πυθμῖν* 'root, stump (?)'. The base of *πυθάνομαι* and its kin is BHĒ(W)DH- and it may be cognate with BHĒ(Y)DH-, if the original sense was 'to learn by inquiry, by probing' (see T. ζ., below).

The base BHĒ(W)-, if 'to be, become' was the original meaning, could hardly be a cognate. But, though this sense is indubitably proethnic, it is not necessarily primary. I think that 'to become, be' is developed from 'to grow' (see k. above and no. 41, and note the definition "wachsen, werden, sein", given by Miklosich, Etym. Woert. d. Slav. Sprachen, s. v. *by-*), which in its turn may be secondary, cf. Germ. *bauen*, 'to build, construct', etc., a definition already discussed under no. 11; see also *struit* in no. 26.

We might expect differentiation of meaning to attach itself to differentiation of phonetic form: this is the way of doublets, witness our English yard/garden. But this differentiation would not be always thorough. Thus we have *findere sarculo* (Horace,

¹ Hirt also (Ablaut, 644) writes a base BHENEDH- 'to splice', deriving NEDH- from (BH)NEDH-. The explanation by addition, by blending of independent words of like meaning, seems to me more in accord with the observed and observable linguistic processes in operation about us.

² A nearly similar metaphor in *κρηπίδα βάλλεσθαι*, Lat. *fundamenta iacere* 'to throw, strike foundations'; *κρηπίς* belongs with Lat. *crepat* ('breaks), cracks, rattles', the sense of 'shoe' (cf. Lat. *crepida* 'solea') having developed from the cobbler's manufacture by beating.

Carm. 1. 11) where *fodere* would seem more idiomatic. So in *defendit, offendit, -fend-* has rather the meaning of Skr. *bādhate* (cf. Lanman's Sanskrit Reader, Vocab. s. v.),¹ while in *offendix, offendimentum* 'cap, band' *-fend-* belongs to *badhnāti*. Nor can we decide whether Alban. *bint* 'I persuade' is a closer cognate to *πειθω* than to *badhnāti* (see above), or whether Goth. *bidjan* belongs to *πειθω* rather than to Skr. *bādhate* (see Uhlenbeck, got. Woert. s. v.).

15) *sināti/sinōti* 'to bind': *n*-flexion in Lat. *sinit* 'lets, allows' (see below). The original meaning was 'to stick > <stitch.' Base *SE(Y)*-/*SŌ(W)*-

Skr. *śāyakaś* 'weapon'
 Lat. *si-ca* 'dagger'
 Skr. *śi-ta* 'furrow'
śi-ram 'plough'
 Lat. *si-num* 'bowl' (=cavatum)
 O. B. *šēya* 'suo'
šē-ti 'net'
 Lith. *šē-tas* 'rope, sieve'
 Lat. *sae-ta* 'bristle, mane'
lves 'sine ws' (see m.)
 Lat. { *salix* } 'willow for
 { *siler* } 'plaiting'
solum 'pavimentum, battuto', cf.
 Skr. *budhnd-*, no. 14
⁴ *sō-lus* 'alone' (=cut off)
⁵ *so-spes* } 'cut loose' (=freed,
si-spes } delivered, saved)
si-nus 'cut, sink, fold'
si-nuat 'folds, bends'
⁶ *serit* (pf. *šēv-i*) 'sows'
⁷ *si-nit* 'leaves, allows'

¹ *de-sivare* 'desinere'
 Skr. *śi-ct* 'needle'
 Lat. *si-bula* 'awl'
śa 'seam' (96)
 Lat. *suit* 'sews'
 O. E. *šēw-an*, O. Sax. *šāian* 'to sew'
οὐδός } 'threshold'
ὀδός } (cf. *fenestra*, no. 14)
ὀδός } 'road'
ὀδός } (see R. below).
 Lat. ¹ *šē-mi* 'half'
 (?) *satis* 'a bursting, teeming'
² *similis* 'like'
simila 'flour'
silex 'cos, flint'
solea 'slipper' (?) 'tie' or *crepida* no. 14)
³ *soluit* 'cuts loose'
solatur 'relaxes, releases'
⁶ *ῥησι* 'throws'
⁷ *šērus* 'late'
⁸ Skr. *śu-yati* 'sews'

Notes:

(1) *šēmi-* 'half', cf. Goth. '*halbs*' (which Uhlenbeck derives from a root meaning 'to cut': Lat. *scalpit*), Skr. *ārdha-* 'half': Lith. *ardýti* 'to separate', Lat. *arbiter* 'halver' (see Rev. de Ling., 1898, no. 4, p. 375, and cf. no. 96). The base *SE-M-* 'to cut' in *ὀμαλός* 'cut smooth, level' (cf. *lēvis*, no. 2); cf. also *similis*; *SMĒ(Y)*-,² no. 12, is cognate.

¹ For the meaning, cf. Lith. *ginù* 'defendo, arceo' (=propulso): O. B. *sinja* 'caedo, meto', Skr. *√han-* 'to strike'. It is not impossible, to be sure, but *-fend-* belongs in this group.

² Is *SMĒY-* a compound root, *SE-* + *MĒ(Y)-*, or *SEM-* + *ĒY-* (see nos. 45, 46, and cf. f., fn.)?

(2) *similis* 'like,' cf. Skr. *viddhās* 'split, ähnlich'; note also *par* (no. 35) which, with *pars* and *portio*, belongs with *πέρει* 'pungit, caedit'.

(3) *soluit*,—blended of *so-* + *luit* (no. 2), each member meaning 'to cut loose'.¹

(4) *sōlus*, cf. *cae-lebs* 'solitary': *caedit* 'cuts', and note the Festus glosses of *solox*, viz.: a) 'lana crassa' (cf. *sae-ta*), b) 'pecus quod passim pascitur non tectum'.

(5) With *sō-spes* cf. *cae-spes* 'turf, sod' (: *caed-it*), defined by Festus, terra in modum lateris caesa . . sive frutex recisus et truncus. Is the suffix *-spet-* cognate with *σπᾶ* 'draws off, strips'?—cf. *σπᾶ-διξ* 'twig' with *cae-spes* 'frutex recisus'.

(6) The primitive sower was not like Millet's Sower, a broadcaster of grain, but rather a 'digger' of holes; he was more like the Teita women (cf. Mason, l. c. pg. 149) "who till the soil with implements of the rudest and simplest form . . . A small cavity is made with the finger, into which a few seeds are dropped, covered over loosely, and Nature is left to do the rest". Tree-planting, as described by Cato, R. R. 133 (cf. also Caecilius ap. Cic., Tusc. I. 31), who uses the verb *serit*, was not a process of sowing but of planting, the setting out of cuttings. The planting of hedges and vegetables we may safely put at an early period (cf. Schrader, l. c. p. 263). Apropos of Skr. *śī-ram* 'plough' and *śītā* 'furrow' it may be noted that *ἀρόω* 'I plough' develops the sense of 'sow'. Or the notion of 'scatter' may have been immediately developed from that of 'cut' (cf. O. Ir. *scailim* 'I scatter': $\sqrt{\text{SKEL}}$ in no. 11, and see N.).

(7) *sinit*. Eng. *lets*, Germ. *lässt* are derived from a base meaning 'to relax, release', and their Greek cognate *ληθεῖν* is glossed by *κοπιᾶν* 'to tire' (: *κόπτει* 'cuts, beats, tires'—Liddell and Scott, s. v. I. 12—so in colloquial English *beats* = 'tires'). Note the curious semantic proportion, Eng. *lets*: *late* :: Lat. *sinit*: *sē-rus* (: Skr. *sāy-ām* 'evening', cf. *-lūros* in *βου-λυρός*).

(8) *śtv-yati* 'sews: the base *saiw-* is of the type designated above as triphthongal (see f.), but the division *st-vyati* is possible, explaining the formation as a blend of *st* + **vyati*. Analogous with **vyati*: *wē(y)-* are *syāti*: *sē(y)-* 'to bind', *dyāti* 'cuts > < binds': *dē(y)-*, *chyāti*: *s)khē(y)-* 'to cut', *gyāti* 'sharpens': *kō(y)-*. Though **vyāti* is not extant in Sanskrit, I infer its

¹ So *κολοῦει* 'clips, docks' is a blend of *κο(λ)-* (no. 11) + *lōw-* (no. 2).

existence from *vyáyati*, which I regard as a blend of *váyati* and **vyáti*; but the blend was probably proethnic as Latin *vière* 'to wind, plait' suggests.

Beside *sē(y)*- 'to stick > < to stitch' stands *sē(y)-k*- 'to cut' (Lat. *sica* 'dagger': *secat* 'cuts'), and *sē(y)-D* 'to bide (see no. 14), dwell, sit' (see Brugmann, Gr. I² § 549 c.), to which *sīdus* 'mond ha us', *sīdit* 'tarries, settles' belong.

16) *grathnāti* 'ties': *n*-form in no. 137 (q. v.).

17) *ubhnāti* 'confines' (= holds together, covers); *n*-flexion in *ὑφαίνει* 'weaves'. Base was *wē(y)-BH*- (see no. 135).

18) *vr̥nātē* / *vr̥nōti* / *urnōti* 'covers, encloses': *n*-forms of divergent meaning in no. 52. For the development of meaning see no. 19.

19) *skunāti* / *skunōti* 'covers'; no *n*-flexion. The cognates *cutis* 'skin', *scūtum* 'shield' warrant the definition of *skunāti* by 'skin-wraps', cf. *κεύ-θες* 'skin-dons'; the use of skins for clothing and for disguise sufficiently justifies these definitions, cf. Lat. *cēlat* 'hides': Lith. *kāilis* 'skin' (base s) *kē(y)-L*-). The base s) *kō(w)*- is attested by Skr. *skāūti* 'tears', *ā-skunoti* (AV.) 'makes incisions', *kū-lam* 'scaur, shore', *kū-p-as* 'pit, fossa'; cf., with *k̄*, *ḡ-las* 'spit, stake'. The primary sense was 'to stick, cut' (cf. Germ. *stecken* 'to hide') and *cutis* meant *δίρμα*; in *κῶας* 'fleece' *κῶοι* 'caves', the long vowel is attested, as well as in *cavus* 'hollow' (from *kəwós*, cf. Studies in Honor of B. L. Gildersleeve, p. 202,¹ and see Mikkola, IF. 16, 100). A further discussion of the base s) *k(h)ē(y)*- / *sk(h)ō(w)*- in no. 119.

20) *stabhnāti* / *stabhnōti* 'props': *n*-flexion in Little Russ. *stebnuty* 'lashes, sews'. The etymological definition of *stabhnāti* is 'shores up' (*shore* 'prop': *shears* 'cuts'), a development exhibited afresh in Ital. *puntellare* 'to shore up', denom. to *puntello* (from *pungit* 'pierces') 'a stick pointed for the support of walls'. In primitive house building 'shoring' and 'lashing' were a conjoint operation, which accounts for the sense of *stebnuty*; cf. *τέκτων* 'joiner', Lat. *texit* 'weaves': Skr. *tákṣati* 'hews'. Cognate in meaning with *stebnuty* 'to lash': *στέφανος*, *στέφος* 'wreath, sarta'; Germ. *stab*, Eng. *staff* reflect rather the sense of 'prop'. Lat. *tabulinum* 'balcony' (i. e. 'propped') exhibits an earlier sense than *tabula* 'board' (for 'prop', cf. Lith. *stėbas* 'post', Wharton, l. c., s. v. *tabula*).

¹ Hereinafter referred to as Studies.

21) *skabhnāti* / *skabhnóti* 'props': no *n*-flexion (but cf. Lat. *scamnum* 'bench'). On the relation of Skr. $\sqrt{skabh-}$ to $\sqrt{stabh-}$ see j. above. Of semantic interest σκίπτεται 'props oneself, leans upon (a staff)'; but σκίπτει σκίπτεται 'throws, hurls (a spear)'.

22) *ḡrathnāti* 'loosens, slackens':¹ no *n*-flexion.

O. E. *-hred-dan*, Germ. *retten* 'to save' show the sense of λύει (no. 2), *soluit*, *sospes* (no. 15). I suppose *ḡrath-* to be ultimately akin to *ḡrṇāti* 'splits' (no. 7), and more closely with *ḡrátkṛṇoti* 'gives assurances', *ḡráddadhāti* 'trusts', with semantic and historic development on the lines suggested for Lat. *foedus* (no. 14).

In a passage like Plautus, Persa, 243, *fide data, credamus*, I suppose *credamus* to repeat the sense of *fide data*. Accordingly, *ḡrath-* was, I take it, a sample cut off as a guarantee of genuineness, or as an earnest for the fulfilment of a bargain, as in later times the sale of land was symbolized by the delivery of a turf cut from the land. The metaphor were easier, more natural to our modern psychology, if *ḡrath-* meant 'to bind' as well as 'to cut loose'. This is not impossible, perhaps. At any rate, Skr. *kṛṇátti* 'cuts' and *kṛṇáti* 'binds' belong to a base KERT-, and *ḡrath-* seems to attest KRET(H), of the same meanings, cf. RER- 'frangere' in *ḡrṇāti*, but SKER- 'caedere' in *kṛṇāti* (see v. below).

23) *lināti* 'sticks to': *n*-forms in Lat. *linit* 'smears' (= streicht), pf. *lĕv-i*, O. Ir. *lenim* 'I hang, stick on', O. N. *lina* 'mulcere'. The base is LĒ(Y)-, mutating with LŌ(W)-, see no. 2.

M. (=C.) To strike, beat; cleanse, wash;—bathe, swim.

In a discussion of the vocalism of Latin *lavit* 'washes' (in Studies, p. 200) I set up a base LĒW-/LŌW-/LĀ(W)- 'to cut, scrape, scour', justifying the semantic question involved by O. Ir. *faiscim* 'I squeeze': Ger. *waschen*, O. B. *myti* 'lavari': Lith. *máuju* 'I strip'. Add Lith. *scalbiù* (:κολάπτω 'caedo', Prellwitz, s. v.) "wasche, mit dem Waschholz schlagend"; Lith. *peĩti* "baden, mit dem Badequast schlagen", O. B. *perq* "schlage, wasche" (BB. 28,6). So in English a beetle is a 'batte de blanchisseuse', and *to battle* = 'to wash (clothes)'; 'to scrub' is ('to scratch), rub, wash' and Skr. *áhata* is defined as "nicht geschlagen, nicht gewaschen". One who has seen a Mexican peasant woman wash has got a glimpse of the industry in nearly a primitive form, and the highly developed Turkish bath for the

¹ Classified as a negative verb of 'binding' (cf. Germ. *losbindet*), and = "to cut loose".

person has been described in my hearing as "a beating, pounding". Washing, in the earlier periods, when men were clad in skins, must have been one of the processes in tanning, and not a process of laundrying or of bathing.¹

That all applications of water, or actions performed by or with water, had a common nomenclature, or derived their nomenclature from one semantic source is by no means likely.² Anybody who has ever seen a puppy or young child swim has seen a noisy beating of the water. "Swimming" is unlikely to have developed through "bathing", from "washing", but it seems to me likely to be of denominative origin, and to come from "boat". Was the boat a "cutter" or a "dug-out"? More probably the latter, cf. σκάφος: σκάπτει³ 'digs'; κέλης, Lat. *celox* "despatch boat": KEL- or KĒL-(?) 'to cut' (cf. no. 11);⁴ Eng. *boat* (from pre-Teutonic *baitō*): BHID 'to split'(?); Lat. *linter*—dismissing the legendary connection with πλυντήρ, but not the spelling *lunter*: *lu-nāti* (see no. 2). The *linter* was unquestionably a "dug-out" (cf. Vergil, Georg. I, 262, Livy, 21, 26). But these water-words enjoy a wide range of meaning, as for instance πλεῖ 'sails, swims': πλύνει 'washes': *pluit* 'rains'. The connotation of 'abundance' (= *ab-un-da-ntia*) seems also well established in this group, e. g. in νάει, νάει 'flows, drips with, abounds in',—a common figure, "a land flowing with milk and honey".⁵

24) *pru-ḡnāti* 'sprinkles: *n*-flexion in O. B. *prysnāti* 'lavare' (Lith. *prausiū*). On the division *pru-ḡnāti* see no. 2. A parallel *l*-form in πλύνει 'lavit' (?) from πλῦσναι). The primitive meaning is reflected in πλύνειν τινά 'to score (abuse) one'; πλυνός 'trough, tub' (= dug-out, cf. λη-νός, no. 2). With the bases PR-U- and PL-U- cf. the bases PER- 'to strike, pierce' (περᾶ and its kin) and PEL- 'strike' (Lat. *pellit* and its kin); see also nos. 27, 35. With

¹ But I have before me a soap advertisement: It "will cut paint, grease, coal soot or any kind of dirt".

² French *couler*, denominative to Lat. *cōlum* 'strainer' has reached a very wide range of meaning: trickles, runs; drops, falls off; flows, melts, leaks; insinuates; sinks, etc.

³ (?) Eng. *ship*: σκάφος from a base SKĒ(Y)BH-?

⁴ Add κελέβη 'cup', κελεός 'wood-pecker', κελεφός 'breaking out', κέλυφος 'pod, shell': could the boat have been conceived as a shell (see *nauscit* above in C)?

⁵ Accordingly, I would identify the base of Lat. *plēnus* 'full', with the base of *pluit* 'rains', viz. PLĒ(W)-, cf. πλέω 'full', from PLĒWO-. Note particularly πλοῦτος 'abundantia, opes', from PLŌWTOS. See no. 27.

a *d*-determinative, Lith. *plūduriu* 'nato'. Forms of this root also show the sense 'to hasten', e. g. AV. *fravaiti*, O. Ir. *conludium* 'eo': *luath* 'celer' (cf. R. below).

25) *punāti* 'cleanses, purifies': no *n*-forms. Lat. *putat* in *amputat* 'cuts about' exhibits the primary sense 'caedere', the compound here preserving, as often, the more original sense; but *putat* 'thinks' is derived from 'cuts, notches, reckons'; cf. *puvire* 'ferire' (Paulus-Festus): Skr. *po-th-ayati* 'mutilates', Lat. *puteus* 'pit', *puter* 'rotten' (if = 'breaking, decaying'; or 'pungent', cf. *caries* 'decay' in no. 7). O. H. G. *fowen* 'to sift' has developed like Lat. *cernit* 'separates, sifts'¹ (: KER-, see no. 11). I write the base as *PĒ(Y)*- / *PŌ(W)*- 'caedere' (see nos. 41, 51, fn., 102, 168), not *PEWə* 'to strain', *pace* Meringer, l. c. 188.

Further cognates:

| | |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| πῑ-νοϛ 'λυθρον, lutum' | πινυτός 'bescheiden' |
| πῑ-ναϛ 'board' (no. 26 fn.) | πavet 'scares at' (no. 14) |
| Skr. <i>pīnākam</i> 'club' | πavit 'strikes' |
| O. B. <i>pīni</i> 'truncus' | πάβει 'breaks off, ceases' (= retundit, |
| Lat. <i>paulum</i> 'little' (12, fn. 2) | resecat) |

N (= F.) (1) To cut, pierce, fix; arrange; (2) spread out; pile up; mix.

The development of meanings in (1) will, I take it, be clear to any English-speaking person who knows that *fix* comes from *figere* 'to pierce'. The sense 'to spread out' may have developed from a sense 'caedere, scindere', cf. O. Ir. *scailim* 'I scatter' (no. 11), and σκεδάσσει 'scatters', Eng. *sheds*, 'pours, spills' (: SK(H)Ē(Y)D- 'to cut' see no. 119); σπείρει 'scatters, sows': πείρει 'pierces, broaches' (no. 31). Spreading out by some mechanical process of beating or splitting would also afford a point of departure for the development of meaning here in question. The development of Eng. *piles* from Lat. *pilum* 'shaft' (= javelin), *pila* 'shaft' (= pillar), and of *stacks*, denominative to *stake* (: *sticks*) sufficiently explain the sense of 'piles up'. The development of the general notion of 'filling' was noted in M.; see also no. 27. The action of 'mixing, stirring' was performed with a *stick*, and verbs of this meaning seem to be denominatives; cf. Fr. *touiller* = Lat. *tudiculare*.

¹ Germ. *schlagen* means 'to pass through a sieve'.

For the general development of ideas cf. Eng. *strikes* = "packs fish in a barrel, lades wine in a cooler", Germ. "*schlägt* waare in ein papier". Eng. *batter* is dough (= a mixture) beaten together. Eng. *rams* 'strikes' has developed the sense of 'tamps, beats, fills up'.

26) *stṛṇāti/stṛṇóti* 'strews'¹: *n*-flexion in *στόρνυμι* 'I spread, smooth': Lat. *sternit*. The base *STER-* may be of denominative origin = 'to put down a skin', cf. the gloss on *storia* 'omne quod sterni potest sive de pelle factum sive aliquo [= alio?] genere storiā dicebant'.² But a sense 'caedere, forare' may be seen in *τείρω* (see the cognates in Prellwitz, s. v.); note *stria* 'furrow', *στορεύς* 'fire-drill', a meaning likely to be primitive in view of the sacredness attaching to fire-making (see Schrader, l. c., s. v. Feuerzeug); while *στέρ-φος/τέρ-φος*, Lat. *tergus* may be semantically interpreted by *δέρμα* (no. 1). The passage from 'beating' to 'smoothing, spreading out' is easy. I note the German denominative *breiten* 'to strew, spread', from *breit* 'broad'; cf. the locution *breit schlagen* 'to spread out, flatten'.³

Of semantic interest:

struit 'heaps up, builds'

στορχάζει 'pens in, stockades'⁴

27) *prṇāti/prṇóti* 'fills': *n*-flexion in O. Ir. *linaim* 'pleo'.

The sense 'fills' has been touched already in F. and in M. and fn., but a fuller discussion seems necessary. Taking what we may call the modern verb root *pack*, denominative to *pack* 'a bundle', note *packs* = 'fills, stuffs', Germ. *packt* (häringe in die

¹ The primitive sense was 'scatters' (?).

² See above on *skunāti* (no. 19) for the general problem involved, and cf. Fr. *joncher* which from 'strewing' with rushes has come to be used for 'scattering' with flowers—blood, corpses.

³ It is unessential whether or no *breit* is from **mr̥aitos*: Skr. *√mr̥it-* 'to fall to pieces', for its combination with *schlagen* 'caedere' shows that 'broadness' is the condition produced by 'beating, striking'. If we combine *breit* with *ferit* 'strikes' we may set up a proethnic locution *BHR̥ITÓM BHER̥ITI* 'breite ferit'. Similarly *BHR̥DHOM BHER̥ITI* yields 'board ferit' (= scindulam scindit). Along the same semantic lines we may explain Eng. *wide* 'breit' as a derivation of the root of Skr. *vidhyati* 'pierces', Lat. *dī-vidit* 'splits', Skr. *vidhūs* 'solus', Lat. *viduus* 'separated, bereaved' (no. 15). The base *LĒ(Y)-DH-/LŌ(W)-DH-* (see no. 2) 'to split' has parallel formations in Germ. *ledig* 'solus'; *liber*, *ἐ-λεῖθερος* 'free', cf. Lat. *liber* 'peel, bark': Germ. *leder* 'δέρμα'.

⁴ Cf. *munire* 'to build a wall, a road', from *moenia* 'ditch-and-dam, stockade' (no. 12).

tonne, wir werden in die kutsche *gepackt*) which show a different development of the sense 'filling' in special contexts.¹ Another concrete development in *farcit* 'stuffs': *φράσσει* 'fences in', which I suppose to have meant 'puts up stakes, tamps with a stick',² cf. Lat. *stipat* 'crowds, presses, crams', denominative to *stip-s* 'stake'.³ Eng. *stuffs* is late Lat. *stuppāt* 'fills with tow' (: *stuppa* 'tow'). The German locution 'der fresser schlägt sich den leib voll' and *stosz* (*holzstosz*) "von dem was aufeinander gestossen, aufgeschichtet wird" seem to conform to *farcit*, *φράσσει* in their development. So (*com*-)*plet* 'fills' (cf. its sexual sense = 'crams') may be specialized from (*com*-)*pellit* ('zusammen—) schlägt, stösst'.⁴ Further cognates of PEL-/PLĒ- are *πóλις* 'city' (i. e. 'stockade', cf. *φράσσει*), *πολύς* 'many' (i. e. 'frequens': *farcit*); English parallel, *stack* 'pile, heap, quantity—plenty' (: *sticks* 'pierces', *stake*, *stockade*=*φράγμα*); cf. the Latin gloss *speltum* 'telum missile'.

The base s)PEL- has, in Lith. *pilti*, the special sense 'to pour',⁵ shed', and as *sheds* is a specialized sense of SKHĒ(Y)-DH- 'to cut', we may infer a similar development of meaning in *pilti*⁶: Eng. *spills*, Germ. *spaltet*; *pilti* also has the violent sense of 'prügeln', as well as the sense 'to fill' (cf. Eng. *rams*).

As the mutation PLŌ(w)- has been found in *πλούτος* (see M. fn.), so PLĒ(Y)- occurs in Gr. *πλείων*, Skr. *prāyas*, and PLĒ(Y)-DH- in *πλί-ν-θ-ος* (: Lettic *plītēt* 'schlagen') 'brick' (i. e. *caespes*, see no. 15, n. 5).

A cognate base s)PER- in no. 35.

¹ Cf. for their semantic value *sich packen*, 'sein bündel schnüren und fort gehen'; die hunde haben ein tier *gepackt*; Fr. *paqueter* 'to bind, imprison'.

² Cf. Cicero, Or. 69. 231 *inferciens verba quasi rimas expleat*.

³ Cf. Eng. *rams* in N. above.

⁴ Note the *n*-flexion of *pellit*.—Cf. the gloss *rumpent* pro implebunt (Vergil, Georg. 3. 328); Lewis and Short define *rumpit* by 'fills to repletion'.—If Lat. *pallidus* 'pale' has gone through the semantic development of Eng. *wan*, which meant 'dark, black' before it meant 'pale', we might define *pallidus* by 'bruised' (: *pellit* 'strikes'), cf. O. Fr. *blesme* 'wan, pale': *blesmir* 'to wound, stain, make pale'.

⁵ See M., end, for PLĒ(W)- 'to overflow'.

⁶ Note Germ. *schüttet* 'sheds, spills, pours', base SKHŌ(W)-DH- 'to cut', further attested by *κώθων* 'cup', *κρίβις* 'dice box', Lat. *cuo* 'helmet' and, with different determinatives, Skr. *khuddti* 'fuit' (= *stösst hinein*), Lat. *scutula* 'little dish'. The kinship of *khuddti* with *caedit* 'fuit' (Catullus, Auctor Priapeus) seems certain; see no. 119.

28) Av. *varənan̥te* 'schwanger machen'.

Cognation with Skr. *vāras* *εῖρος* 'breadth', (base WER-), or with the base WEL-, to be described in no. 52, is equally possible. For the sense—which is closely involved with the flexional type—cf. Lat. *com-plet* (: *com-pellit*)—in low English—'knocks up' (see no. 27).

29) *grīṇāti* 1) mixes; 2) boils, roasts:¹ *n*-flexion in *κεράννυμι* / *κίρηνυμι* 'I mix', O. E. *hrinan* 'to touch'. I take the primary meaning to have been "to beat,² stir with a stick" (= Ital. *mestare*),³ as, for instance, one stirs boiling clothes; the same stick used as a spit would give rise to a denominative 'spits, roasts'. German forms [O. H. G. *h)ruoren*] show a base extended by *s*, and perhaps *κεράννυμι* is for **κερα-σνυμι* (see no. 2); cf. also Skr. *ḥṛīyati* 'sticks on',⁴ *ḥṛīyati* 'sticks together' (= makes touch). I infer a base *ṛ(E)ṛē(y)-s-* 'to pierce, stick, stir with a stick', cognate with *ṛER-* (see no. 7), and ultimately with *s)KER*, (see no. 11). Cognates: *cribrum* 'sieve',⁵ Lith. *szerys* 'brush', Lat. *crinis* 'hair', *crista* 'tuft', *cris-pus* 'curly' (= woolly). The meanings 'hair, tuft, brush' are derived as in *lāvas* (cf. no. 2) "abgeschnittenes, schur, wolle, haar", the meaning 'sieve' as in Fr. *sas* from Lat. *saetacium* (: *saeta*, 'hair, bristles', cf. Lith. *sėtas* 'rope, sieve' in no. 15), *κόσκινον* 'sieve': *κεσκίων* 'tow'.

30) *mathnāti* 'stirs': no certain *n*-forms. This verb is of denominative origin (see no. 39): *mānthan-* / *math-* / *mathi-* 'stirring-stick', Lith. *mentūris*, Lat. *mentula* 'membrum virile'. The *n* is an infix, cf. O. B. *motati se* 'agitari'. Is *mathi-* akin to *methi-* 'stake' (no. 12), base *mē(y)-T-* / *mē(y)-DH-* (see j. above)? Note Lat. *mēta* 'goal-post'. The *mēta* was a phallus,⁶ see the illustration in Schreiber's Atlas, pl. 27. 1.

¹ Whitney subdivides, writing 1 *grīṇā-* 2 *crīṇā-*.

² Cf. Eng. *batter* 'dough' (= beaten up), and Fr. *tourner* (no. 25).

³ Cf. *frucare*, defined in Körtling's Lat.-Roman Woert.³ 3521 by "cercare tentando con bastone, mestare"; *mestare* 'to mix, mingle, blend' (from Lat. *mixtus*) has the specialized sense "to stir with a pot-stick". In *frucare* (from Lat. *furca* 'fork'), the development of ideas is perfectly transparent.

⁴ Cf. Eng. *strikes* 'adheres'.

⁵ Is *cribrum* from *ṛRIS-ROM*, or from *ṛRī-DHROM* (: Eng. *riddle*)? Gr. *κησέπα* (?σ from σσ) 'sieve' may also be derived from a base *ṛREY-S-*.

⁶ This is still clearer for the *mēta*-stone in a cornmill, which is clearly a 'glans penis' (see Mau-Kelsey's Pompeii³ fig. 321). In Greece, the *νόσσα* was either a goal-post or a gravestone, both phallic, as the earlier Homeric

With *mēta/mentula* cf. μή-δεα 'genitalia' (base MĒ(Y)-D-).

O. To strike, kindle.

The development of senses here assumed is in thorough accord with the known facts of primitive fire-making, viz. by 'striking' a flint (cf. *feuer schlagen*), by 'boring' it out with a fire-drill or other process of friction; or we may think of fire as produced by the lightning 'stroke'. An implement known as a 'strike-a-light' is still in use. Accordingly, we may derive Skr. *pāvakās* 'fire' from the root of Lat. *pavit* 'strikes' [cf. *πῦρ* 'fire': *pū-rus* ('rubbed') clean—see no. 25]. There is no phonetic reason why Eng. *hot* does not belong with *hit*, and both to Lat. *caedit* 'cuts', cf. Goth. *hais* 'torch' (Uhlenbeck got. Woert. s. v.): KEI- [? KĒ(Y)-], with meaning as in *derai* 'faggot, torch': DĒ(Y)- to split > < splice' (see L. fn.). Very clear is the metaphor in Germ. *ansteckt* 'kindles', cf. Gr. *ἄπτει* 'puts touchwood to', O. N. *kynda* 'to inflame, kindle', ultimately denominative to Lat. *candela* (Skeat, l. c., s. v. 2 kindle). There is yet another way of mediating between the notions of 'burning' and 'piercing', and that is by noting the metaphor in locutions like 'prickly heat', 'die hitze sticht', which describe the effect of 'burning' on the sentient human; cf. Eng. *stinging nettle*=Germ. *brenn-nessel*. Furthermore, fire was perhaps the most effective cutting instrument at the command of the neolithic woodworker (cf. Mason, l. c., p. 32), 'burning' being derived from 'cutting', rather than conversely, as I have it set down in *Studies*, p. 202. If the root SNĒ(Y)-/SNŌ(W)- nowhere reaches the sense of 'kindle' it approaches it in the frequent combination *νηεῖν ξύλα—ὑλῆν*,

description shows: "A fathom's height above the ground standeth a withered stump . . . and two white stones on either side thereof are fixed at the joining of the track . . . Whether it be a monument of some man dead long ago, or have been made their goal (*νόσσα*), etc. (Lang's Version, *Iliad*, Φ 327 sq.).—A word on the etymology of *νόσσα*: it belongs with *νόσσει* 'pungit' (: NU-ĜH-) and with Lat. *nuc-s* (NU-Ē) 'glans, acorn', 'acorn' being subsequent in meaning to 'glans' (sc. penis); so, I take it, *gladius* 'sword' and *βάλλανος* 'pessulus' show an earlier sense than their cognates *glans*, *βάλλανος* 'mast' (i. e. *nucēs*); in short, the 'acorn' was named from its likeness to the glans penis, and not conversely. Were not the *nucēs* distributed at Italian weddings *glandes*, phallic symbols outright?—In English, *mast* 'stake' (= *gladius*, *νόσσα*) and *mast* 'glands, nucēs' are phonetically identical, and have been so as far back as their phonetic history is of record [? base MĒ(Y)-S-D- : Skr. *méd(h)as* 'fat', remotely cognate with *math-* 'stirring stick', cf. *methi-* 'stake' (no. 12)].

etc. (cf. $\pi\upsilon\rho\tau'$ $\epsilon\upsilon$ $\nu\eta\eta\sigma\alpha\iota$, o 322), but in these contexts it is of "building" rather than of "kindling" a fire we must think.

Supposing a verb to have developed a sense 'to kindle' from a more primitive 'to strike', it may well have been that the derived sense completely ousted the original sense, or that the two meanings were allocated to different grades of the root (see no. 93). Something might also be said for the 'split and rayed' conception shown by primitive pictures of the sun; cf. Ital. *spuntare* (= 'to prick apart') used of the 'bursting forth of the sun's rays'. This admits of interpreting Lat. *candel* 'shines' and its kin as from s)KHĒ(Y)-N-DH- 'to split, burst'.

31) *subhnāti* 'entzündet, inflammiert' (= accendit): no *n*-flexion. The definitions are figurative only, but the primitive sense was 'schlägt' (see Johansson, I. F. 3, 237). The base SU-BH- is an extension of sō(w)- 'to split > < splice' (in no. 15).

As to form, *subhnāti* 'schlägt' may be a blend of sō(w)- 'to strike' + **bhnāti*: O. Ir. *benim* 'I strike, cut'.

32) *usnāti* 'kindles': no *n*-forms. Possible cognates are *uṣya-lam*, 'δέμνιον', *uṣnīṣas* 'head-band' (both in the Atharvan, the folklore Veda): *εὐνή* 'bed' (cf. *δέμνιον*). These words might be held to attest as base US- 'to bind', cf. *ἀπτει* 'binds > < kindles' (Eng. torch: *torquet* 'twists', *δεραι*: *DĒ(Y)*- 'to split > < splice'). The *Dhātupāṭha* cites a root *vas* 'stossen, stechen, futuere' (cf. *uṣas* 'amator'), which admits of our setting up a weak base US- 'to split > < splice'. Add Skr. *usrās*, *uṣṭā*, *uṣtras* 'bovis (i u g a t u s)', *ὑσ-πληγέ* 'snare', *ὑσ-κλος* 'lacing' *ὑσ-γη* 'bunch of flowers'.

33) *pluṣnāti* 'burns, singes': no *n*-forms. Was the primary sense 'sticht'? Cf. *plūs-is* 'stinging insect', Lat. *pruril* 'itches, burns to'.

P (= H) To strike, hit, attain, obtain.

The correlation of ideas here assumed is so well set forth by the meanings of *τυγχάνει* that I may spare myself any further demonstration; cf. *κτάομαι* 'I get', *κέκτημαι* *habeo*: *κτίννυμι* 'I slay, schlage', (? with -νν- for -σν- as in no. 2): *κρĒ(Y)*-. In a primitive period the most important obtaining was the getting of game, by means of the spear or the snare or pit-fall. Thus we may unite Skr. *nāṣati* 'nanciscitur' (= trifft) and *nāṣyati* 'wird getroffen' (: *necat* 'kills', *nocet* 'hurts'). Here belongs:

34) *aṣnīṣe* 'attains' (from **nĕ-*): *n*-flexion in Armen. *hasanem*.

35) *sp̥r̥h̥āti* 'wins, liberat, saves': *n*-flexion in *sp̥ernit* 'strikes off, rejects', M. E. *spurnen*. Base *s*)PER- 'to pierce':

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <i>sparum</i> 'spear' (Lucilius) | <i>πείρει</i> 'broaches' |
| <i>σπείρει</i> 'scatters, sows' (N.) | <i>par-vus</i> 'small' (12, fn. 2) |
| <i>parat</i> 'procures (P.), makes' (see no. 11) | <i>par</i> 'similis' (15, n. 2) |
| Base <i>s</i>)PEL- no. 27 | <i>πρ-άττει</i> 'makes' |

36) Av. *vānaiti*/*vanaoiti* 'siegt', M. Pers. *vānītan* 'besiegen, schlagen': *n*-form in Lat. *vēnātur* 'hunts'.

Base *wē(y)*- 'to split > <splice'. The first of these contrasting meanings has not hitherto been demonstrated. I infer it from

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Skr. <i>vācī</i> 'axe' | (?) <i>veçī</i> 'needle' |
| Av. <i>vānaoiti</i> 'necat, caedit' | |

and, with determinatives,

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>√vadh-</i> 'to kill' | <i>√vidh-</i> 'to pierce' (cf. no. 55) |
| <i>vādhriś</i> 'τομίας' | <i>vāpati</i> 'schert' |
| <i>vāpati</i> 'throws, strews, sows' (cf. N) | <i>vellā</i> 'litus' (no. 2) |
| <i>vapā</i> 'δέρτρον' (no. 1) | Lat. <i>vitium</i> 'culpa' (no. 14) |
| | <i>vītat</i> 'shuns' (if = 'cuts loose from') ¹ |

This base appears in no. 51, in the form *wēy*-L-.

37) *gr̥bh̥h̥āti* 'seizes': *n*-flexion in Lith. *grabinė-ti* 'to pull to and fro'.

In q. above, it was held that in *grabinė-ti*, *-nė-* = *-Nē(y)*-. Further note that *-inė-* corresponds to *-avei-*, in *λανθ-άει-s*, e. g.

The cognates of this group no longer strongly attest the primary sense of 'hit', if that ever existed, but Germ. *garbe* 'sheaf' does not disprove it, cf. *ἀμαλλα* 'garbe' (: *ἀμα* 'cuts, reaps'), even though it has developed the sense of 'manipulum'. The sense of 'pluck, gather, seize' may be derived on the lines shown in 'pinch, nip'; cf. Lat. *stringit* 'plucks, gathers': *striga* 'swath, furrow'. With *garbe* we may unite Lat. *forbea/herba* 'fodder' (cf. Germ. *heu* : *hauen*), Gr. *φορβή* 'pasturage', assuming primitive *G^wHORB(H)A*.

38) *muṣṣāti* 'steals': no *n*-forms, and no certain cognates, thinks Uhlenbeck, who hesitatingly compares *muṣṣis* 'fist'. Add

¹ Cf. *φεῖδομαι* 'I avoid': Skr. *bhid-* 'to split' (in no. 14), see also nos. 162-3.

mūsālas 'pestle', ἀμύσασθαι¹ 'to beat, surpass, conquer', μύστρον 'spoon' [*spoon* means 'splinter'], μιστούλλει (? for μυστίλλει) 'crumbles, breaks up'; Lat. *mustus* 'gepresstes'. The base s)MÖ(W)- is attested by Lat. *movet* 'stösst', *mōles* 'stosz' (see no. 27), pile', μῶλος 'schlachtgetümmel'. The base s)MĒ(Y)- (see no. 12) is parallel, cf. σμῖς (Hesychius), σμί-ν-θος 'mouse': MŪ-s- 'mouse' (= 'cutter, nibbler'). For the general semantic problems involved note Eng. *strikes* "takes by force, fraud or stealth, as money; steals" (Standard Dictionary).

Of some semantic interest is *mușilas* 'naked', the primitive sense of which must have been 'stript', cf. Ital. *spoglio* = 'nudo' (see B. β, above).²

39) *jināti* 'robs': *n*-flexion (and cognates) only in Iranian, it would appear (but see no. 60); cf. O. Pers. *a-dinā* 'ademit' (*d* from Ḡ). So far as the sense goes, there is no need to separate from βιάομαι 'I defraud, cheat' (see no. 9). I set up as base ḠĒ(Y)- 'caedere':

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| γέ-νυς 'edge, point', | γέ-νυς 'jaw' ⁴ |
| Goth. <i>kinuus</i> (<i>nn</i> from <i>nw</i>) 'jaw' | <i>keinan</i> 'buds' (no. 41) |
| Skr. <i>jé-h-ate</i> ('splits), gapes, pants' ⁵ | |

40) *ḡamñite* 'labors, zurichtet, bereitet': *n*-flexion in κάμνει 'forges, tills, labors; wins by labor'. With the general sense attained in Greek (cf. Liddell and Scott, s. v. κάμνω I) cf. Eng. *shapes*, Germ. *schaft*: Lith. *skabēti* 'dolare'.

The base is RŌM- 'to split > < splice' (?):

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| Skr. <i>ḡdmalam</i> 'macula, culpa' (no. 11) | <i>ḡamitā</i> 'schlächter' |
| <i>ḡimas</i> 'zertheiler, arranger' | (?) Lat. <i>cōm-it</i> 'fixes (: figit), arranges' |

¹ Cf. *mușñāti* in the half ḡloka (Böhtlingk, Chrest. 251. 5)

tasya mușñāti sāubhāgyam tasya kāntim vilumpati
'surpasses (con t u n d it) his good luck, destroys his lustre'.

Here the smaller Petersburg lexicon expressly renders *mușñāti* by "übertrifft".

² May not an Indo-Iranian **mușitds* be reflected in the initial *m*- of Av. *mayno*: Skr. *nagnds*?

³ Whitney defines by 'injures', a definition that would put *jināti* under class K.

⁴ I have heard children recite the following rigmarole: "forehead bender; eyes seer; nose smeller; mouth eater; chin chopper."

⁵ If *h* is a determinative, but if we have broken reduplication, from a parallel base ḠHĒ(Y)- (see no. 53).

| | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| καμάρα 'pit, arch' | κάμνος 'forge' |
| κάμαξ 'stake, prop' | κώμης 'bundle, tuft' ¹ |
| κόμη 'hair' | κώμος 'village' (if = stockade) |
| κόμβομα 'robe, band' | Skr. <i>ḥimbas</i> 'pod-fruit' |

With the neuter sense of *ḥamyati* 'is tired, rests, ceases' cf. *κοπιᾷ* 'is tired,' *κόπος* 'weariness': *κόπτει* 'caedit', noting colloquialisms like *beats* = 'tires', is (dead) *beat* = 'is (very) tired'.

The classification of this no. is admittedly inadequate; true, *κάμνει* means sporadically 'to attain, win by labor', but the sense of 'labors' in the group develops immediately from 'strikes' or 'digs', without passing through the stage 'attains'. In no. 41 also, the sense 'thrives' does not develop from 'attains', though it possibly might have done so, for in English 'thrives' has developed from 'to grasp, seize'.

41) *puṣṇāti* 'thrives': no *n*-forms and no base *PUS-* 'to thrive' attested out of Sanskrit. The definitions of \sqrt{pus} would of themselves show that the sense was 'blooms, flourishes'; cf. also *pūṣkaram* 'lotus', *puṣpam* 'flower'. The notions 'bloom, flower' develop, however, from 'to burst, split', as in the following examples,

Lith. *dýgti* 'to bud, sprout' (: *dygyùs* 'pointed')

Skr. *saṁtudayati* 'buds, sprouts' (: \sqrt{tud} 'to strike')

sphuṭati 'berstet, aufblüht' (: Germ. *spallet*, no. 27)

O. H. G. *brisan* 'to break, bud'

O. E. *cinan* 'to burst, bud' (no. 39)

Ger. *ausschlägt* 'buds'.

Fr. *brocher*, *poindre*, *pointer* describe the 'coming to a point' of buds, and we speak of buds 'bursting'; cf. Skr. *ud bhid*, like Germ. *aufbrechen*; Ital. *s-puntare* (cf. Fr. *brocher*) means 'to bud, bloom'. Further note the locutions *Spargel stösst*, *erd-beeren stossen*, *ranken*, *das korn ist in die höhe geschlagen*; *jetter des bourgeons*,—*des scions*,—*des racines*. If we look for a similar development for \sqrt{pus} or *pu-*² [for *pu-snāti* may be the ultimate division (see no. 2)], we may connect with the base *PŌ(w)-* of no. 25. This is the base of *pu-trás* 'son',—*πῶλος* 'colt', *paîr* 'son', Lat. *pover/puer*—i. e. 'scion', which is of the com-

¹ Uhlenbeck, s. v. *ḥamī*, sets up a root *ḥem* 'to cover'.

² It is possible to divide *pū-ṣkaram*, defining *pu-* as 'breaking, bursting' and *ṣkaram* as 'splitting, bursting' (see no. 11). Note the sense of *pustakam* 'scriptum' (: *scribere* 'scratch, write').

monest metaphors, e. g., *ἔσρος*, *φίτυμα*,¹ *ὄζος*, Skr. *tūk/tokām* 'liberi': Av. *taoxma* 'bud'. In view of the frequently approved explanation of *materies*—"das zu mater gehört, denn die 'mutter', das kernholz des stammes, ist das baumaterial wie Solmsen, Berlin. Phil. Woch. 1902, Sp. 1140, gesehen hat" (Meringer, l. c., p. 158)—*pu-trás* might be defined in the light of the phrase "a chip of the old block".

Q. To split, bite, eat.

This semantic chain is clearly exhibited by *φιδίτιον* 'cena', Eng. *bites*: Lat. *findit* (no. 14), as well as by Germ. *zehren* (no. 1). Also note *mordet* 'bites, eats' [: no. 4, cf. *μηῆλαμ* 'edible lotus' (no. 5)], *cibi-cida* 'glutton', *κόπτει* 'pecks, gnaws'; *κορύννυσι* (with -*νν*- for -*σν*-, no. 2?) 'stuffs, (feeds)': Lith. *szėrti* 'füttern', belonging to the base of no. 7, if we define *κορύννυσι* by 'rumpit', as in the gloss cited in no. 22; Lat. *satis* 'bursting, teeming' (in no. 15), as we say "full to bursting"; Eng. *browzes* (see Skeat, s. v.), which derives from O. E. *brēotan* 'to break'. In the German locution "der fresser schlägt sich den leib voll" (see no. 27) we find a kindred metaphor; Germ. *frisst* 'edit' = Eng. *frets* 'eum piget (: *pingit* 'tattoos, pricks, punctures', *piger* 'lazy' = 'sticking',—cf. *νωχελής*, above, C. β—, see Am. Jr. Phil. 21, 198), edit' (= *rodit*).

In this pastoral land of Texas 'staking' means 'tying a horse to a stake for him to graze',² and 'holding' means 'to hold a horse by a halter for him to graze'; and I have heard of one housekeeper that used to say with homely kindness, when bidding her guests to fall to, "lariat yourselves out".

42) *aḡnāti* 'eats'. This verb, without plain cognates, it would appear, is but a special case of *aḡnīlē* 'strikes, attains',—no. 34.

¹ I have no great confidence in the derivation of *φίτυμα* from *φῑτι*, but rather connect it directly with the base *BHĒ(V)*- 'stossen, schlagen' in no. 14. The mutation *BHŌ(W)*- 'to thrive, grow' became specialized in the sense 'to become, be' (no. 14, fn.). As to *BHĒ(V)*- 'to strike, hit' / *BHŌ(W)*- 'to become, be', at least as violent a shift of meaning obtains in *κυρεῖ* 'hits' (Homer): *κυρεῖ ἱστί* (Trag.); note also Germ. *lebt* ('sticks,) *vivit*' (no. 167).—The primitive sense of *BHŌ(W)*- persists in Lat. *futilis* (why -*ult*- for -*ūt*-?—cf. *mitto* for **mīto*?) 'brittle' (: O. E. *brēotan* 'frangere', cf. *fragilis*). The obscene word *futuit* 'battuit, tundit, caedit' also attests *BHŌ(W)*- 'to strike'.

² Skr. *√vap-* has developed the sense of 'graze' from 'shear'; the other *√vap-* 'to scatter, strew, sprinkle' is secondary, having developed from *√vap-* 'κολούει' as Ir. *scaillim* 'I scatter' from *SKEL-* (no. 11).

43) 2 *gr̥ñāti* 'swallows': *n*-flexion in Sanskrit only. A reason for the Sanskrit *n*-flexion in this verb and the last may be sought in the proethnic nasal flexion of the type Lat. *findit*: Eng. *bites*.

The notion of 'swallows' may have been derived from 'splits, gapes, yawns—swallows up', but the following words warrant the development discussed under Q. (but see no. 61).

Lat. *veru* 'spit' (Umbr. *beru*-)

Skr. *gīrīs* 'mons' (: *mentula*, see no. 30)

Skr. *gḍrādā* 'pruriens'

gārtas 'fossa'

βάπαθρον 'pit'¹

R. (= D.) Verbs of Motion.

The development of verbs of motion from verbs of the general sense 'caedere' is attested by words and phrases like the following: "to strike out,—for,—across" [M. E. *stricken* is an out-and-out verb of motion, though the primary meaning of the root (in no. 26) was 'ferire']; "to cut through,—across"; Germ. "schlagen—, streichen durch"; "to hit the road" = *τίμνειν ὁδόν*; M. E. *swappen* 'to strike, go quickly'; *pricks* 'spurs on, hastens'; "futura pungunt" 'the future hastens'; *tuditans* 'pushing, driving on, agile'. In nouns, note Germ. *schneide* "durch den wald gehauenes weg".² In the phrase 'to cut and run' cut connotes, among other things, motion; cf. also Germ. *sich links schlagen*. Still different is 'tears along'.

In conformity with the above locutions one is in a position to understand the semantic relation of *πείπει* 'pierces', *ἀναπείπει* 'spits, broaches': Eng. *fares*; Lat. *terit* 'bores': Skr. *tārati* 'crosses', *tvārate* 'hastens': T(W)ER- 'pierces, drills', cf. Eng. *splits* = "walks or runs rapidly"; Lat. *celer* 'swift': KEL- 'to cut' (nos. 11, 51 fn.).

¹ Beside *βάπαθρον*, Ion. *βέπεθρον*, stands *βέθρον* and *βόθρος*, both = 'pit'. In view of doublets like *πιθάκνη* / *φιδάκνη*, the dogmatism which has separated *βόθρος* from *fodit* 'digs' was never justified, though as for *βόθρος*, its *β*- might be explained from *βάπαθρον*, etc. A thorough and unprejudiced study of all the occurrences will, I venture to predict, reveal a state of facts we might graphically represent by writing B(H)ED(H)-, which means that dissimilation of aspirates was a process already at its beginning in the proethnic period.

² Cf. the following (from *Munsey's Magazine*, Apr. 1904, p. 19): He and his wife had ridden for three hours through the Timli forest without seeing more than the cut of the "ride" before them.

In *wends*, from *winds*, we see how a verb of motion might have developed from the verbs discussed in L.

Or, if we start with 'drives', a causative of 'hastens', one who has ever seen an Italian donkey goaded and beaten along (cf. Boccaccio, Decam. 8. 9) will be satisfied of the part played by beating in driving. So Germ. *schlagen* means 'to drive (cattle)', cf. *δτρύνει* 'goads on'. Most convincing is *ελαύνει*; I 'drives' (intrans. 'pushes on'); II 'strikes'; III 'beats, forges', though I and III should be arranged as specializations of II, in my opinion.¹

44) *inṭē/inōti* 'sends, drives, pushes (= thrusts); schaltet' (: *schilt* 'scolds'): no *n*-forms. Cognate with *ēti* 'goes'. The root *ey-* is probably of pronominal origin, and the nasal suffixes have been picked up from other verbs, semantically developed along the lines discussed in R., but see no. 45.

45) *iṣ-ṇāti* (or *i-ṣṇāti*, as in no. 2) 'sends': no *n*-forms of clearly related meaning; *ινάει*, *ινέει*, *ινόει* 'cleans, empties out', if cognate, are interesting for their triple vocalism.

Was the base, *ēy-s-* 'caedere'?² Cf. *αἶνων* (from **αισνων*) 'πτίσσω' (= 'ventilans' or 'pinsens'), *αἶμους* (from **αισμο-*) 'ὀβελίσκους, αἰμύλος' ὁξὺς ἐν τῷ λέγειν; *αἶμος* would be a grade of *lós*, Skr. *īṣus* 'arrow', *iṣīkā* 'reed', cf. Lat. *aer-umnula* (Festus) 'carrying stick', *aero* 'basket'.

46) Av. *miθnāiti* 'sends': no *n*-forms known to me. Lat. *mittit* (i. e. **mz-til*) is doubtless a cognate, with the violent meaning of 'hurls' (cf. *βάλλει*, 1) 'strikes', 2) 'throws'), cognate with *minat* 'drives' (= strikes, in no. 12, cf. also *mathnāti* in no. 30). For the meaning, cf. *ἵημι* 'sends' which, whether it be cognate with *iacit* (Hirt, Ablaut, 52 anm.) or with *serit* 'sows' (see 16), seems to have developed from ('cuts,) scatters, throws'.

47) *junāti* 'hastens, drives on': no *n*-forms, and no cognates out of Indo-Iranian. The base *ḡō(w)-* may be a mutating form of *ḡē(y)-* in no. 39, the former meaning 'to strike out for', the latter 'to strike' = 'to steal' (no. 38); cf. nos. 9, 105.

¹ So far as the verbs comprised in D. above are concerned, they may have developed from the motion of flowing water, cf. Skr. *snāti* 'drips', Germ. *rinnen* / *rennen*, Gr. *θεῖω* (of racers, of ships).

² This is the base I have written *ais-* (for *ais-*) (1) 'capit', (2) 'captat', (3) 'festinat', in Am. Jr. Phil. 25, 170. The meaning 'capit' is a specialization of the meanings in P. (H.), above.

48) *riṇāti* 'sets flowing': *n*-flexion in Gr. ῥίπτει, ῥίπνυι (-vv- for σv-) 'stirs, raises, incites, drives', O. Bulg. *riṇāti* 'stossen, fließen', Goth. *rinnan* 'rennen, rinnen'. The original meaning seems to me preserved in Greek and Old Bulgarian. What the original source of the metaphor was in 'sets-flowing' is not ascertainable, perhaps: was it the 'breaking out' of water from the ground in springs, the 'breaking out' of water from the clouds by the thunderbolt, or the 'riving' (cf. Skeat, l. c., s. v., rive) of a channel by the stream itself? It would seem possible, in the terms of this triune metaphor, to unite the Sanskrit base *ray-* 'sets flowing' with the base *rav-* (see Uhlenbeck, s. v.) 'breaks in pieces, splits up', with the mutation *RE(V)-/RÖ(W)-*. To this base would belong Lat. *rēs* 'share': Skr. *rayis*, *rāti* ('shares,') gives', Lat. *rō-dit* 'gnaws', *rū-dus* 'broken stone', *rē-tur* ('scores,') reckons, thinks' (see no. 25, above). With the sense 'to splice > < to split' Lat. *rē-te* 'net', *ra-tis* 'raft'. Beside the Sanskrit base *ray-* 'to flow', note the base *srau-*.

S. Verbs of Emotion.

The psychology of our time recognizes that the emotions are produced by what the scientific call '*stimuli*', impulses which the language of the people knows how to describe as 'pricks' and 'itches' (cf. Lat. *scabies* 'itch, longing': *scabit* 'scratches', Lith. *skabėti* 'dolare'). Sensations of pleasure and displeasure 'seize' upon us (cf. ein packendes, fesselndes buch), or 'strike' us (cf. *perculit* 'strikes, impresses'; stösst=ärgert mich), even sensations as generalized as a 'thought' or 'notion'. Our pains 'pierce' and 'sting'¹ and 'bite' us (*mordemur* 'we are bitten by pains', σμερδαλέος/σμερδνός 'painful'; *dolet* 'it grieves': *dolat* 'hacks'²—see my explanation of other impersonals of emotion in Am. Jr. Phil. 21, 197). We 'strike' ourselves in token of 'mourning' (κόπτεσθαι—, τύπτεσθαι τινα); fears strike us (*perculit* 'shocks, frightens'; schreck schlägt in die glieder)³. Joys 'prick' and 'tickle' us (late Lat. *mutuum scabere* 'to praise one another'="you tickle me and I'll tickle you"). We 'split' and 'burst' with anger; 'scratching' and 'massage' (= 'chafing') may be at once a solace or an irritation (Lat. *mulcet* 'strokes,

¹ Cf. Browning (The Return of the Druses, III prope finem), And stinging pleasures please less and sting more.

² Cf. Eng. *hurts*: Fr. *heurter* 'to knock, hit'.

³ Cf. *pavet* 'scares at': *pavit* 'strikes' (no. 25).

soothes': *mulcat* 'beats'). In German, *reizen*, which seems to be a cognate of *reissen* 'to incise, tear', is used of the arousing of either 'anger' or 'joy', and implies 'to vex' or 'to charm'. General considerations like these justify us in supposing that the base SNĒ(Y)- 'caedere' (see B., above) has entered into the flexional system of verbs of emotion.¹

49) *prīṇāti* 'delights, satisfies': no cognates with *n*-flexion. The definition of Persian *ā-frīdan*, 'to shape', justifies setting up a base *prī* (from PRĀY-), which would be cognate with the base S)PER- 'to pierce' of no. 35 (see for the correlation of meaning no. 11); cf. *πρῆ-ων* 'saw'. 'Biting' is a well-known gesture of physical pleasure (cf., e. g., for the Roman poets, *morsus* in Pichon's de Serm. Amat. s. v.), and plays a rôle in the sexual life of animals. Further, cf. Lat. *privus* 'solus' (see no. 15), *privat* 'cuts off, separates, robs'. With *privus* 'solus' cf. *prīṇāti* 'solatur'.

50) *ramṇāti* 'delights, calms': no *n*-forms. The definitions 'steht still, ruht' and 'pflegt der liebe' may derive from the sense of 'sticks' (cf. Goth. *beidan* in no. 14, and Skr. *ūṣas* 'amator' in no. 32), cf. also *ἐ-ρημ-ος* 'solus' (?), a definition in curious accord with Germ. *einsiedler* (cf. SĒ(Y)D- in no. 15) 'hermit, hermit'.

51) *vr̥ṇātē* / *vr̥ṇōti* 'chooses': no *n*-forms of immediately related meaning. In the oldest language only middle forms are used, and a development from 'hit, seize, grasp' may be suspected, as in *αἰπεῖσθαι* 'to choose': *αἰπεῖν* 'to seize, strike, capture' (see P. above), cf. also *ὀπίγασθαι* 'to grasp—, reach—, strike at; desire'.

I suppose *vellus* 'skin' (from **velnos*) to have had the ordinary development from a verb meaning 'caedere', cf. *δέμμα* (no. 1), Skr. *cārma*, *ḡārma* 'cover' (: *ḡalākā* 'scindula', base *ĀER-* / *ĀEL-* in no. 7). The base WEL- 'to cover' (no. 18) is identical (see the semantic discussion in no. 19), and the primitive meaning was 'to split > < splice'. The special sense 'to choose, wish' may have developed as in Eng. *picks* 'chooses'.²

¹ Particularly appropriate for a discussion of the ideas in the verbs of emotion is the following citation from Meringer, l. c. p. 180: *ich denke, wir müssen es aufgeben mit bedeutungsansätzen wie 'sich gefallen' 'sich irgendwo freuen' uz rechnen.*

² The history of *picks* is semantically most instructive, if Skeat is right in referring it to the Romance "root" *pic, picc-*, set down by Körtling, l. c., no. 6119. The Latin *picus* 'wood pecker', (*pica* 'magpie') gave a name to a

Cognates of WEL-:

| | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| <i>volnus</i> 'wound' | Skr. <i>vraṇds</i> | <i>vellit</i> 'picks, ² plucks, tears' |
| <i>vellus</i> 'skin' | | |

Base WEL- $\tilde{\kappa}$ -.

| | | |
|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Skr. <i>vdḷḡas</i> 'twig' | Av. <i>varṇso</i> | O. B. <i>vlasū</i> 'hair' |
| <i>vulsit</i> (pf. to <i>vellit</i>) ³ | <i>Volcanus</i> 'smith' | |

Base WEL-G-.

| | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Skr. <i>vdṛḡas</i> 'schar' | Lat. <i>volgus</i> 'crowd' |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|

Base W $\tilde{\text{E}}$ (Y)-L- (see no. 36).

| | |
|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>villus</i> 'vellus' ⁴ | (F) <i>εἰλέει</i> 'covers, wraps' |
| <i>εἰλη</i> / <i>ilah</i> 'schar' | <i>volvit</i> 'wraps' |
| <i>ἑλῃει</i> 'covers' | <i>vēlat</i> (or from * <i>ves-lat</i> ?) 'covers' |
| <i>villa</i> 'cover, shed' (?) | <i>vēlox</i> 'swift' ⁵ |
| <i>vallum</i> 'stockade' | <i>vallus</i> 'stake, picket' |
| (?) <i>vīles</i> 'sharpshooter, picket' | <i>vilis</i> 'piccolo' (Körting. l. c. 6), σμηκρός (no. 12) |

52) *ἡρητίε* 'is angry': no *n*-forms, and no cognates cited by Uhlenbeck.

I would connect with *χόλος* 'gall', *χολῆ*, *χολούται* 'is angry',⁶ noting the *n*-flexion of Lat. *fel*, gen. *fellis* for **felnis*.⁷

cutting and digging tool, whence a verb root 'to cut, dig', etc.; in Spanish and Portuguese this took the form *picar* "gleichsam festpicken, anmachen"—generalized = 'to splice'.—We see a somewhat similar idea, developed from a different point of departure, in Fr. *fouiller* (from *fodicularē* 'to dig') which means 'to search', and in Ital. *frucare* (see no. 29) 'to search' (= 'hunt for').—That *picus* and *pica* were onomatopoeic words of Italian origin is possible, certainly, though nothing hinders their being derivatives of a root *PE*(Y)- 'to cut, strike', mutating with *PÖ*(W)- (nos. 25, 41).

¹ With syncope, cf. *ὠλένη* / *ὠλλός* 'elbow'.

² Cf. *vellicat* 'pinches, nips'. The specialized meaning of *vellit* is comparable with that of *carpit* (see no. 11).

³ The exhibition of a $\tilde{\kappa}$ in the perfect is on a line with the Greek aor.-pf. sign - κ . To *vulsit*, *vulsus* (ptc.) was fashioned on the analogy of *rosi* / *rosus*, *rasi* / *rasus*, etc. The normal participial formation is exhibited by *vultus* 'προτομή';

cf. *vultur* 'seizer' (= ac-cipiter) *vulva* 'scheide'.

⁴ Cf. *ἀγγελος*, Skr. *āṅgiras-* for a like variation between -*o*- and -*es*- stems.

⁵ *vēlox* 'swift': *vellit* 'tears away' :: *rapidus* 'swift': *rapit* 'tears off'; cf. *volat* 'speeds' with Eng. 'tears along', and note *ὀξύς* 'acutus, celer'.

⁶ It is customary to derive the sense 'gall' from 'yellow', but I would reverse this process, cf. color names like 'buff', 'pink' and 'violet'.

⁷ The *f*- of *fel* is for G^{WH}, the χ of *χόλος* for GH-: this variation is attested also by O. B. *zēlēt* / *zēlēt* 'gall' (Miklosich, l. c., s. vv. *zēlēt*, *zēlēt*). Uhlenbeck (s. v. *hāris*) gives GH for G^{WH}, but Lat. *f*- would seem to prove that G^{WH} is the right form, unless all three gutturals be admitted.

What was the notion the primitive man had of 'gall' and the 'gall-bladder? That far from primitive man, Sophocles, in the archaic language of augury, used the plural *χολαί* for 'gall-bladder', in this context (Antig. 1010) *μετάρσιοι χολαί διεσπείροντο*, interpreted to mean "the sacrificer could no longer trace the divided gall-ducts." Euripides also attests the importance in augury of the forking of the gall-ducts in Elec. 827-8, "The *σπλάγχνα* had no lobe, and the gates (*πύλαι*) and receptacles (*δοχαί*) of the gall hardby showed to the augur unpropitious entrances." It would seem possible, then, to fix upon the forking of the gall-duct as the characteristic to which its name was due.¹ But the gall-bladder itself lies in a 'fissure' (*fossa, furche*) of the liver, which it divides into right and quadrate lobes. It seems inadmissible to separate *χόλος* from *χολάδες* 'guts, Gedärme', for we may suppose *χολάδες*, like the two definitions cited for it, to have meant etymologically 'channels', or 'fissures'. Accordingly, *χόλος* may be suspected of belonging with *χηλή* (with *ā* in the dialects, from secondarily lengthened *ῥ*) 'cleft, a hoof', with *χεῖλος/χέλλος* 'lip' (from **χελνος* or **χελφος*, cf. *χελύνη* 'lip') and with Skr. *halā-* 'plough' (? cf. Armen. *dzlem* 'furrow, plough'). The base would be *GHĒ(Y)-L-* 'to split', intrans. 'to gape', derived from *GHĒ(Y)-*, in Lat. *hi-scit*, Gr. *χάσκει*. To this base belongs Lat. *hīlum* 'straw' (?) (splinter, particle?), *χῆλος* 'fodder, heu' (: *hauen*), and *hillae* (from **hilnae*) 'smaller intestines', cf. *χολάδες*; *hi-ulcus* 'gaping, cracking' is of morphological interest, having the look of being a compound of *hi-* and *ulco-* 'a sore, split'. More on the base *GHĒ(Y)* in no. 126.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.

EDWIN W. FAY.

¹ The 'forking' of the gall-duct and the plural use of *χολαί*, let us surmise that Lat. *bilis* 'gall-bladder' is for **dwi- + *helis* (*hel-* with *GH-*) 'having two ducts'.

III.—NOTE ON THE HISPERICA FAMINA.

I venture to think that the papers of Geyer in the Archiv für Lateinische Lexicographie (II 255), of Stowasser (III 168), of Thurneysen (III 546), and the recent paper by Prof. Robinson Ellis (Journal of Philology, No. 56), have rendered the task of ascertaining the meaning of much that was unexplained in the Hisperica Famina much easier than before.

The text which, for the present, must be held to be authoritative is that of Stowasser in the "Dreizehnter Jahresbericht über das K. K. Franz-Joseph-Gymnasium" (Vienna, 1887). This work is very hard to procure; but after much trouble I succeeded in getting a copy lent me by Mr. Stevenson, of St. John's College, Oxford, and have thus been able to use Stowasser's text. In 1893 appeared "Nennius Vindicatus" by Zimmer (Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung); the "Anhang" to this work is an essay "on the Hisperica Famina, and other S. W. British records of the 6th century." Zimmer throws much light on the history and the contents of this extraordinary piece of ecclesiastical euphuism. He arrives at the conclusion that it is the work of a British monk in S. W. Britain about the sixth century. Stowasser conceived it to be the work of an Irish monk, and Geyer thought that the work was produced in Spain. A perusal of Zimmer's chapter proves, I think, convincingly that his theory is right. The few notes here appended are intended to supplement those given in the edition of Stowasser and the references are to his text.

I have translated the first three chapters and have added a few notes on a few difficult passages.

The work seems to be an attempt by a monk to show off his learning to the world, and must not be taken as representing any Latin style prevailing at any period. He coins new Latin words and borrows at large from Greek and Hebrew. He seems to have modelled his cadences on the so-called "golden lines" of the Roman poets, employed by them to close a period with special gravity, as Vergil's *Impiaque aeternam timuerunt saecula noctem*. The paucity of Celtic words is striking. The transition from

classical to vulgar Latin forms is seen in *oleda* for *olida*; in words like *spatha* for *gladius*; and the use of words like *ceteri* answering to *alii* seems to point to an imperfect knowledge of classical Latin.

The first three chapters, which I have translated, seem to contain the following train of thought:

"1. I have fallen in with a company of rhetoricians and I rejoice at it, but I check my joy and give rein to my wonder. Whither are they bent, and what mean they to discuss? Questions of peace, or war? or will they describe a shipwreck or a battle? In any case I am as good as they are, and I challenge any one of them.

"2. These rhetoricians profess to speak the purest Latin, a Latin as pleasant to hear as the hum of bees. They are a choice and rare company; but sometimes they will meet with a blockhead dull as a tortoise, who would paralyse them unless they averted this crisis by a prayer—Would that I were only a master of pure Italian Latin, I would utter a flood of classical utterance—(addressing one of the company) what is the special task to which you are addressing yourself? Are you going to turn builder, smelter or maybe fluteplayer?

"3. Ah! I can divine it now! You are coming to your own home! You follow with your gaze the well-known flocks and are dressed in holiday attire—You bid farewell to wise disquisitions (*sed* (28) should be *nec*, or else the word seems used in a strange sense). Hence I see that you long for your home, which is brightened up at your approach: your mother, your children, await you: all is gay at your home-coming."

Much of the diction of the author of the *Hisperica Famina* resembles that of the grammarian Virgilius Maro. An excellent commentary upon Cap. 1 of *Hisperica Famina* is afforded by Maro, *Epistolae* p. 138 Edit. Huemer. "De his formis uerborum inter Regulum Cappadocum et Sedulum Romanum non minima quaestio habita est, quae usque ad gladiatorum pene conflictum pervenit. Quindecim namque noctibus totidemque simul diebus insomnes et indapes mansere, tribus militibus utrimque sumptis." But much of the diction of Maro resembles that of our author: e. g. his use of *palare* = *revelare*.

The inflated language may be paralleled by the mock euphuism of Sir Piercie Shafton in the "Monastery", e. g. "Marry, and I am glad of it, young Audacity (I will call you my Audacity,

and you will call me your Condescension, while we are on these terms of unnatural Equality), I am glad of your ignorance with all my heart. For we martialists proportion the punishments which we inflict upon our opposites to the length and hazard of the efforts wherewith they oppose themselves to us. And I see not why you, being but a tyro, may not be held sufficiently punished for your outrecuidance and orgillous presumption, by the loss of an ear, an eye, or even a finger, accompanied by some fleshwound of depth and severity suited to your error."

Text of Chs. 1, 2, 3:—

1. *Ampla pectoralem suscitavit vernia cavernam, mestum extrico pulmone tonstrum, sed gaudifluam pectoreis arto procellam arthereis, cum insignes sophiae speculator arcatores, qui egregiam urbani tenoris propinant faucibus linpham vipereosque litteraturae plasmant syllogismos. Cui mundano triquadrae telluris artico rhetorum florigera flectit habenas caterva et qui remota vasti fundaminis deseruere competa? Utrum fabulosas per ora depromunt gazas? Num trucida altercaminum (M. 480) inter soboles pubescunt litigia? An placorea abucat proles sceptrum?*

Utrum saevus armatorum coetus toxica corrui certandi in acie, ut fuis ostrei cruoris vivis candida olivarent madiada? Seu spumaticum bombosi tithis flustrum inertes oppressit naufragis remiges? An horridum communi stragi vapuit acculas letum? Quos edocetis fastos? Quique adheretis rhetori? Hinc lectorum sollertem invito obello certatorem, qui sophicam plantaverit avidae palestram. Et trinos antea dimicavi athletas, inertes mac-tavi duelles ac robustos multavi coevos fortioresque prostavi in acie cyclopes. Hinc nullum subterfugio aequae-vum. Dum truculenta me vellicant spicula, protinus versatilem evagino spatham, quae almas trucidat statuas. Arboream capto iduma peltam, quae carneas cluit tutamine pernas. Ferralem vibro pugionem, cuius pitheum assiles macerat rostrum cidones, ob [hoc] cunctos lastro in agone coevos.

2. *Haec compta dictaminum fulget sparsio, at nullos vitioso aggere glomerat logos, ac sospitem lecto libramine artat vigorem et aequali plasmamine, mellifluam populans ausonici faminis per guttura sparginem, velut innumera apium concavis discurrunt examina apiastris melchillentaque sorbillant fluentia alveariis, ac solitos stemicant rostris favos. Hic comptus arcatorum exomicat coetus, cui dudum (M. 481) per lapsa temporum stadia parem non*

crevimus phalangem nec futura temporalis globi per pagula aequiparatam fulgidi rumoris speculabimur catervam. Sed praesto horrendus asstat chelidrus, qui talem vipereo ictu saucia-bit turbam, nisi vasti exigerint rectorem poli, qui florigerum agmen reguloso solverit discrimine. Novello temporei globaminis cyclo hispericum arripere tonui sceptrum; ob hoc rudem stemico logum ac exiguus serpit per ora rivus. Quod si amplo temporalis aevi stadio ausonica me alligasset catena, sonoreus faminis per guttura popularet haustus ac inmensus urbani tenoris manasset faucibus tollus. Quod propriferum plasmas orgium? Utrum alma scindis securibus robora, uti eo quadrigona densis stemicares oratoria tabulatis? An flammigero coctas obrizum clibano, auriferas solidis cudere lunulas marthellis? Seu tinolam tensis suscitās odam chordis? Forte concavas sonoreis proflas cicutas harmoniis?

3. Sed non intelligibili mentis acumine praestulor, quod lanigeras odorosa observas per pascua bidentium turmas, qui obessa arcatorum assiduo tramite sectaris concilia, ac cicniam gemellis bai[u]las curvanam scapulis, rutulātem alboreis artas calamidem madiadis, pexamque carneis tolibus amplecteris camisiām. Nec sophica ingenioso acumine auscultas mysteria, sed doctoreas effeto conamine comitaris historum turmas. Hinc mirificum tibi ingenioso (M. 482) libramine palo consultum, proprigenum natalis fundi irruere solum, ut agrica robusto gestu plasmaveris orgea, et pantia [.] raptis astant septa termopili. Pubescentes pecorea depascunt segetes agmina, veternas mesta genitrix lacrimosis obugat genas guttis, et infantilis mu[r]murat in [.] vagitus, ac florigera resonat clangore per arva. Externum proprifera editrix abucat marem placoreasque blandis concelebrant nuptias thalamis. Haec pantia natalem te stignant orgea adire limitem.

Translation of Chs. 1, 2, 3:—

1. A vast joy makes my heart throb to its depths. I dismiss bewildered sorrow from my vitals, but I repress a current of glee in the veins of my heart, when I look at the renowned repositories of wisdom, who administer the precious draught of city life, and who patch up poisonous potpourris of literature: to whatever region¹ of the three-cornered land is the flowery throng of

¹ The meaning seems to be 'whither are these rhetoricians going?' If this was written in Britain the *triquadra tellus* may refer to that island.

rhetoricians turning its course? and who are these virtuosos who have turned their backs on the lonesome tracks of the waste earth's end? are they dispensing the rich treasures of their talk for the public? Can it be that the deadly strife of controversy is waxing strong among this brood? Or does this assembly call for the sceptre of peace? Does a savage gathering of armed warriors muster eager for the wild line of battle, to stain white bodies with dark runnels of purple blood? Or has the creaming tide of echoing Tithis whelmed the exhausted rowers in a wreck? Or has some grim death carried off their neighbours in a common disaster? What stories are you preaching? And to which rhetorician give you your allegiance? To this literary duel¹ I challenge the champion who to his satisfaction has trodden a school of wisdom. And I have before now defied three athletes together; I have trounced cowardly combatants and I have pounded stout fighters of my own age, and have knocked down giants, stronger than myself, in battle. So I shun to meet no one of my own age. While their savage arrows prick me, straightway I unsheathe my handy sword which kills those complacent dummies. I clutch with my hand my white² target which defends the flesh of my legs with its shelter. I brandish my dagger of iron whose venomous beak makes mincemeat of the lathy tricksters.³ I break up⁴ all my coevals in a fight.

2. This precious shower of words glitters, by no awkward barriers confining the diction, and husbands its strength by an exquisite balance and by equable device, trilling sweet descant of Ausonian speech through the speaker's throat⁵ by this shower of words passing through Latin throats⁶; just as countless swarms of bees go here and there in their hollow hives, and sip the honey streams in their homes and set in order, as they are wont, their combs with their beaks. Here the precious collection of

¹ Obellum = avellum. Explained by Götz, Thes. Gl., as bellum civile dum in duas partes dividitur. See Ellis, Journal of Philology, p. 210.

² I read 'alboream' for 'arboream'.

³ Pitheus is explained by S. after Rhÿs as derived from the dragon Pytho, and so poisonous. I take cidon = κίδων, a subst. connected with κίδαφος. Vide L. and Scott s. v.

⁴ Lastro = lastrico.

⁵ I read 'pipitans'.

⁶ I. e., those *rhetores* who should speak good Latin prefer an Euphuistic jargon.

closet-writers coruscates: we have never seen a phalanx to match it in the stages of past time, nor shall we in the future limits¹ of this contemporary world gaze on a similar crowd so showy and so bustling. But mark the horrid deaf-adder at hand, who shall wound this crowd with his poisonous dart, unless they can dethrone the ruler of the spacious heaven, who (there) might free yon flowery troop from its perils from snakes.²

Only in this last cycle of our temporal globe, I have tried to seize the sceptre of the western land; hence it is that the parlance which I compose is untutored, and hence the current of words which from my mouth flows scanty.

If, however, for a longer space of time the Italian chain had riveted me, then a resonant wave of speech would run wild³ and a boundless torrent of refined language should have come sweeping from my jaws. (Here, I take it, the speaker addresses himself to one of the rhetoricians.) What particular work are you designing? Are you cleaving the gentle oaks with axes, that you may construct square chapels with solid planks? Or are you heating pure gold in fiery furnace, to forge golden crescents with stout hammers? Or are you raising some harmonious tune and stringing the chords? Or chances it that you are filling the hemlock reeds with your harmonies of sound?

3. But I am remarking with a most transcendent keenness that you are observing the woolly flocks of sheep ranging over the fragrant pastures; you who pursue with course undeviating the packed meetings of the closet philosophers, and carry a scarlet sunshade over your two shoulders, fitting a red cloak on your white body,⁴ and you clasp to your fleshly frame a blouse of fine linen.⁵ These are no philosophic mysteries to which you are listening, but you are accompanying the learned throng of savants with exhausting efforts. And so I disclose to you my singular

¹ I retain 'pagula' and understand it as = repagula, vide Stowasser ad loc.

² The meaning of this seems to be: "but there is a student as stupid as a chelydrus: against dullness even the gods fight in vain." *Regulosus* is from *regulus*, a kind of snake.

³ If the proper reading be 'popularet' the word must be used absolutely: it is possible that some word like 'pipilaret' may be the real reading,—with the meaning "sound melodiously".

⁴ I read *coccineam gemellis bailas (baiulas) curvanam scapulis, rutulantem (aliter rectulantem) alboreis artans calamida (chlamyda) madiadis*. If *cicniam* = *κύκνειον* the meaning will be 'white'.

⁵ I read 'camisia' for 'camina'.

purpose, balancing my thoughts [this way and that revolving my swift mind], to pass into the domain of your native farm, and see how you have carried out the rustic work with your stout efforts, and all your sheepfolds stand by the gushing (read rapidis) warm springs. Your herds of cattle browse the springing crops; your old mother is watering her aged cheeks with dropping tears; and the cry of your children sounds muffled, and echoes its notes over the flowery fields. The dam who claims him summons her spouse: and they keep the pleasant festival of their union by their merry meeting. All these signs bear me witness that you are approaching the eve of your natal day.

Commentary:—

Page 1. line 2. Tonstrum: probably from *tono*, in the sense of bewilderment, hence grief: cf. Spanish *tontar*, to bewilder. Pulmo seems not used in classical Latin as the seat of other passions than mirth. Spatham = Spanish *espada*, *espaza*. 19. Protinus versatilem evagino spatham quae almas trucidat statuas. 'Straightway I unsheathe my active sword which cuts down the complacent idiots'. The statuae seem to be his empty-headed adversaries; cf. Juvenal, VIII, 52. At tu Nil nisi Cecropides, truncoque simillimus Hermae. He may even be thinking of the mutilation of the Hermes statues. 22. Cluit = cludit. Cf. Fr. *clôre*. Assiles cidones, 'the slender, lathy weaklings'. May not cidones be connected with Sp. *chotar*, to suck? Cf. Ital. *ciotto*, a dolt. Lastro = laxico, I dismember. Cf. *pastrico*, but see note ad verb. in translation below.

2. Arripere tenui sceptrum: Tonui = tenui, in the sense of the French *j'ai tenu à*, I have desired. Tollus 'a stream,' perhaps from *tubellus*, but explained by S. as probably from *θολός* mud. The meaning of the end of paragraph 2 seems to be 'If I had only more mastery of the Ausonica lingua (i. e. good Latin), I would speak more volubly on any subject that might be desired: on any task you might care to make your own; whether to build a chapel, or to work gold, or to sing and play on the flute'.

3. Cicneam (cicineam) gemellis bailas (= baiulas) curvanam scapulis: rutilantem (*aliter* rectulantem) alboreis artas calamidem madiadis, pexamque carneis tolibus amplecteris camisiā. 'You carry a red sunguard over your two shoulders: you fit to you a white cloak over your white limbs and clasp a delicate shirt to your bodily frame'. Cicineam probably with Stowasser from

cici, the castor oil plant, from whose seeds some dye was extracted, or from *kúrvēlos*.

4. *Macides*: evidently means 'steeps' or precipices: cf. *Sp. macía*, a wall. It might mean 'waste lands', and might thus be connected with the Corsican word *mâquis* used for 'rough forest land'. *Veluti rosea aestivi laris veternas cremat pyras rubigine amarcas, ac aruca favellosis minorat robora tumulis*—read here *pyra*. 'Even as a ruddy fire burns with a glow the old boughs of larch wood in the summer, and reduces to nothing the uprooted stumps on ashy mounds'. *Aruca* seems a corruption of *eruca* from *exrun-care*: the roots are grubbed out from the low, round hills where they grew. *Quatinus vitreum tetigeris patula poli samum cuba*. *Samus* is no doubt the Greek word *σάμος*, a height: *cuba* = *cupa*, the hollow hand, explained by *S.* as the elbow. *Arotus* can hardly mean anything but "a star": possibly 'the thrower of light', from *arrojo*. Cf. *Sp. arrojar*, but more probably from Hebrew *orr*, "light", pl. *orôth*, from which word the Latin is taken. So *S.*

5. *Bis senos exploro vechros qui ausonicam lacerant palatham*. 'I am tracking out twelve defects which mar the pure diction of the Romans'. So Prof. R. Ellis, no doubt rightly: but none have explained *vechros*, which undoubtedly means faults, defects: and is to be explained as a Germanic loan-word: OHG *brecho*, a fault: Vide Kluge s. v. Surely *palatham* means nothing but palate. Cf. Fr. *palais*: *Sp. paladar*, gums. *Alius clarifero ortus vechrus solo, quo hispericum reguloso ictu violatur eulogium: sensibiles partiminum corrodit domescas*. *Stowasser* is clearly right in regarding *clarifero solo* as signifying 'solecisms' from *Soli*: the *clariferus* probably refers to the *claras Asiae urbes*, and *regulosus* is the adjective formed from *regulus* = *basiliscus*. *Domescas* seems to me to = *domesticas partes*, and to signify the qualities, home-properties: cf. Provençal *domesgue*. "Another fault arises from the land of sunny Solus, whereby the glory of the Latin language is by a poisonous attack impaired: it spoils the plain properties of the different parts of speech".

6. *Cibonea Pliadum non exomicant fulgora*. This seems a reference to 'polus dum sidera pascit.' 'The heaven-fed sheen of the Pleiades does not shoot forth'. *Exomico* seems a hybrid, *ἐξω* and *mico*. *Merseum solifluus eruit nevum tractus*. 'The sunny tract drives forth dun colour of night'; *merseus* is

explained by S. as = nightly, from *mersa*, night; *nevum* used of the colour of the wart or excrescence, "brownness". *Sudos*—from *sudum* which is used by Arnobius in the sense of thick or clotted. *Sennosis motibus* "with movements of their teeth"; *sennosus* is a Latinized form of Hebrew *shen*, a tooth. *Sablones* 'sands' = Sp. *sablon*. Surely *attritas arrigas* means the 'crumbling furrows',—Prov. 'arrega', said to come from a Celtic word *ricâ*; but if with S., *artiga* be read, the word remains in the modern Spanish *artiga*, a fresh ploughed field. For this word Körting s. v. *artica* assumes an Iberian origin. See Körting s. v.

7. *Uchas* may be right; cf. Prov. 'uchar, to cry'; but S. reads *echas* = ἡχάς. *Framis* = *frameis*, here used for 'axes'.

LIVERPOOL UNIVERSITY.

H. A. STRONG.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

TWO BOOKS ON ROMAN TOPOGRAPHY:

- I. The Topography and Monuments of Ancient Rome. By SAMUEL BALL PLATNER. Allyn and Bacon, Boston, 1904.
- II. Das Forum Romanum. By CH. HUELSEN. Loescher and Co., Rome, 1904.

(1). Professor Platner declares that his book "is intended to serve as an introduction to the topography of ancient Rome for students of Roman antiquities and history, and incidentally as a book of reference for those who have any special interest in the monuments which still remain". A book written with such a purpose, in English, bearing the date 1904, will surely be hailed with joy by many, especially by those who read French, German and Italian only with difficulty or not at all. A heavy weight of responsibility, therefore, rested on the author to make his book absolutely correct, at least in matters which are simply questions of fact and not wholly or largely matters of opinion or interpretation of fact.

How has the author met this responsibility?

There are twenty chapters, with titles as follows: Sources of Information; General Topography of Rome and the Campagna; Building Materials and Methods; History of the Development of the City; The Tiber and its Bridges; Aqueducts and Sewers; Walls, Gates, and Roads; The Palatine Hill; The Forum; The Imperial Fora; The Capitoline Hill; The Sacra Via and the Velia; The Campus Martius; The District between the Forum, the Tiber, and the Circus Maximus; The Aventine; The Caelian; The Esquiline; The Via Lata and the Pincian Hill; The Quirinal and the Viminal; The Transtiberine District. An index of seventeen pages closes the book.

The book attempts to cover the whole field of the topography of ancient Rome; it locates and describes not only existing ruins, but includes many structures of which no vestige now remains. From this point of view the book has value, in that it will give to the student information not so readily accessible elsewhere, at least in English. The very numerous references given in the footnotes, first to the sources of information in ancient literature and inscriptions, and, secondly, to the most important material in current periodicals and foreign manuals of topography constitute a very valuable, if not the most valuable, part of the book. The maps, plans and illustrations are likewise helpful, though one wishes more of them had been given.

One thing the book is not, a convenient guide-book to the existing remains in Rome. The description of the Forum, for example, is worked out on a plan quite different from that followed by Professor Huelsen in his *Das Forum Romanum*. Mr. Platner begins by devoting four pages to the history of the successive rebuildings of the Forum. Then he discusses the streets that ran into or through the Forum; then all the temples in the Forum (in the narrower sense) are treated together, next the two basilicas. Further on all the arches in the Forum are treated together. I cannot help feeling that this scheme of treating the monuments by classes rather than in topographical sequence will be confusing to a reader who has not seen the Forum, even though he has the help of Professor Platner's plans. Again, one on the ground who followed the author's description would traverse and re-traverse the Forum till he lost all sense of the points of the compass.

In certain respects the book in its present form suffers from grievous blemishes. In his preface the author says he has not been able to visit Rome since June, 1900. Yet the book is pre-eminently one that should have been written in Rome; at least the manuscript or the proof-sheets should have been compared with the monuments themselves.

Numerous inconsistencies show that the author has not orientated himself properly. Thus, on page 127, the Cermalus is called the north, the Palatium the south side of the Palatine; on page 33 they are described as the western and the eastern halves of the hill. On page 129 the author calls the S. Teodoro side (i. e. the Cermalus) the western. Had the author adhered throughout, with reference to the Palatine, to the convenient if somewhat inaccurate terminology current concerning the Forum, by which the Tabularium end is called the western, he would have saved himself and his readers, here and elsewhere, much confusion. Professor Platner does indeed often use this system with reference to both Forum and Palatine, but he is far from consistent, employing often a points of the compass system.

On page 138 the altar of Aius Locutius is said to stand "On the *northwest*¹ slope of the (Palatine) hill"; on page 139 we read "There are on that part of the hill which lies between the domus Augustana, the domus Tiberiana, and the *southwest*¹ edge (of the hill) the remains of two temples". These statements, on successive pages, refer to precisely the same part of the Palatine.

On page 214 the author says: "Caesar *decided to remove* the Rostra to the Forum, but his definite plan seems not to have been carried out until after 42 B. C. Thenceforth the Rostra of the Empire was a long platform extending across the *west* end of the Forum". Now, on page 179 we have already read that "Julius Caesar *erected* a second platform, the rostra Iulia, at the *east* end of the Forum, in front of the Regia", etc.

¹ The Italics here and elsewhere are mine.

On page 302 the jambs of the Arch of Titus containing the famous reliefs are described as the west and the east sides of the arch, though the arch stands at the east end of the Forum and itself faces east.

On page 373 the Pons Sublicius is described, in passing, as "later pons Aemilius". On page 80 the author says of the Pons Sublicius: "The strongest evidence seems to indicate a point between the porta trigemina and the ruined ponte rotto, and very probably close to the latter". On this same page (80) a paragraph is headed, "Pons Aemilius, perhaps the ruined ponte Rotto"!

On page 137 we have a brief discussion of the temple on the Palatine which in recent times has been generally regarded as that of the Magna Mater. It closes thus: "Inscriptions relating to the Magna Mater, a portion of a colossal female figure—undoubtedly the goddess—seated on a throne, and a fragment of a base with the paws of lions, the regular attendants of Cybele, have been found near the podium of this temple". From all this one would naturally infer that the author believed the temple to be that of the Magna Mater. Yet on page 140 he expresses his opinion that these very ruins are those of the Templum Victoriae, though from page 135 one would infer that this latter temple stood on the west side of the hill near the Church of S. Teodoro.

On page 149 we read that the *western* portion of the peristyle of the domus Augustana has not yet been excavated; on page 150, line 12, the author refers to the corresponding unexcavated portion of the triclinium of this palace as the *eastern* portion. The latter, not the former statement, is correct.

Again, cross-references are lacking often where their insertion would have been most helpful, even to the author himself in forcing him to correlate his statements at various places in his book. Thus, on page 74 the Septizonium is called "a seven-zoned structure". There is nothing to explain this till we reach page 156. On page 17 it is stated that the accumulation of the fragments heaped together in the Monte Testaccio began as early as the last century of the Republic; on page 399 we read "it is certain that the dumping of debris on this spot began as early as the time of Augustus". On page 149, in the discussion of the so-called lararium in the Domus Augustana, reference is made to an altar once found in this room, but now non-existent. On page 137, we read "The stone needle itself (sc. which represented Cybele) was removed by Elagabalus (from the Templum Magnae Matris) to the lararium of the Flavian Palace, where it was probably seen by Bianchini in 1725". The two passages refer to the same thing (i. e. the altar and the stone needle are one), but there is nothing in the text or notes to show it. See Haugwitz, *Der Palatin*, pp. 24, 25.

Sometimes names are employed which may well be misleading. On page 73 we read "To the Flavians Rome owed . . . the . . . stadium on the Palatine". On page 144 the same structure is called Hippodromus. Cf. page 152: "Adjoining the domus Augustana . . . is the Hippodromus, which has usually, though erroneously, been called the Stadium of Domitian". On page 153 the author declares "This Hippodromus was the garden of the Flavian Palace". On page 154 the opinion is expressed (without hint that it had previously been advanced; but cf. Richter, *Topographie der Stadt Rom*, p. 155) that the puzzling oval in this structure was a private menagerie of the emperors. On page 152 the exedra on the east side is called an "imperial box". What is one to make of all this? What is the appropriateness of the term Hippodromus, if this place was a garden? Some light was surely needed here, especially since "race-course" is the only meaning given for *hippodromus* in Lewis and Short, and *ἵπποδρόμος* is similarly defined by Liddell and Scott. Even Georges's statement that *hippodromus* denoted a "Rennbahn für Rosse und Wagen bei den Römern in Privatgärten oder Villen" does not help very much here, for in this Hippodromus, at least in the form in which the visitor sees it to-day, driving a chariot or carriage was impossible. For the needed light one need go only to Haugwitz, *Der Palatin*, p. 80. Cf. also Richter, l. c.

A few other points, out of many, may be noted. On page 154 it is stated that the masonry enclosing the oval in the Hippodromus is three *meters* high; it is not at any point more than three *feet* high. On page 203 we read: "Many of them (i. e. the statues of the Vestals in the Atrium Vestae) have inscribed pedestals". One would naturally infer that the statues and the pedestals now to be seen there belong together. They do not. Huelsen, *Das Forum Romanum*, p. 167, describes how statues and pedestals were found together in a great heap. "Infolge dessen lässt sich zu keiner Statue die zugehörige Inschrift constatieren".

On pp. 216, 250 it is stated categorically that the so-called marble *plutei* (or, as others call them, the rostra reliefs) now standing on the floor of the Forum once stood somewhere on the Rostra. Not a particle of proof is adduced. One regrets that the author was not so sceptical here as he seems to have been concerning the identification of the buildings represented on these *plutei*. (It occurs to me to ask why, if these reliefs were originally intended for the sides of the Rostra, as e. g. Huelsen assumes, they were made so small; they are only about half as long as the sides of the Rostra. Why did the architect, in spite of the fact that he might have taken about twice as much room, limit himself so, and hence deliberately interfere with the careful and complete presentation of the buildings now only hinted at in the reliefs?)

On page 270 we read that the *north* hemicycle of Trajan's Forum is well preserved and has been partially excavated, but

nothing is said to indicate where it may be seen. Professor Platner's terminology with reference to this Forum as a whole makes this omission especially unfortunate. For example, on page 272 he declares that the doorway in the base of the column is in the *east* side; on page 273 he calls the bibliotheca side of this Forum its *west* end. As a matter of fact, the excavation, as one looks at it now, runs northwest to southeast. Repeated testing of the matter by the sun, by compass readings, maps and statements in other books leaves no doubt on that subject. Indeed, we shall not err greatly in saying that the square in which the column now stands runs north and south. The door in the base of the column is on the *south* side. The two Churches lie on the *north* side (here the bibliotheca lay in ancient times). The hemicycle which is yet partially extant lies to the *east* of the houses which line the *east* side of the square. The Place Vendome in Paris lies somewhat as does the Piazza del Foro Trajano (to be accurate, it runs from northeast to southwest); to bring out more clearly the extent to which the Trajan column was here imitated, we may note that the door in the Vendome column, too, is in the south side.

On page 273 it is stated that the shaft of the Trajan column consists of 23 blocks or drums. I ascended the column last summer and counted the drums; there are 18 in the shaft itself. The interior of the column is entirely clean and sweet and fairly well lighted; the drums in the inner column, if I may so describe it, round which the staircase winds, correspond exactly to those in the outer column. There is thus a double means of securing a correct count. The number 23 describes rather the number of divisions in the spiral of sculptures (I may note that I cannot reconcile Lanciani's description of this column, given in his *Ruins and Excavations*, etc., p. 317, with the facts. He, too, among other things, gives the number of blocks in the shaft as 23). Lastly, I note that, so far as I can judge, Professor Platner accepts without reserve (see pages 268, 269) the statement of the inscription on the Trajan column, that the column was erected to indicate "to what height the hill was cut away for this great work". I must confess to some unwillingness to accept the inscription literally. See also Middleton, *Remains*, ii. 24, 25: "Brocchi (Suolo di Roma, p. 133) has shown from geological evidence that the ridge can never have approached the height of 100 feet, and he suggests that the inscription means that the hill was cut back to a point where the Quirinal was 100 feet high—a very probable explanation".

Lack of space forbids the consideration of other points. Enough has been said, however, to indicate that the book needs a thorough revision.

(2). Professor Huelsen's book falls into two parts, the one treating the general history of the Forum, the other describing its monuments.

Part I is subdivided into three sections: (a) the Forum in antiquity, (b) the Forum in the Middle Ages, (c) the excavations in the Forum since the Renaissance. The three sections cover 47 pages. In the first section (pp. 1-23) Professor Huelsen considers the etymology of the word *forum*, the use of the Forum in the various stages of its development as market-place, the center of civil and political life, etc., the development of the imperial fora, the Forum of the later empire, and finally the destruction of the Forum. In the second section we have the history of the Forum from the days of Theodoric to those of Rienzi; in the third section we have an account of the excavations from the fifteenth century to the present time. Discoveries as late as those of March, 1904, are noted.

In Part II, pages 48-174, the several buildings and monuments now existing in the Forum, in the narrower sense of the term, are discussed. The author begins with the Basilica Iulia, the first building into which one steps as he enters the Forum from the Via delle Grazie, and takes the reader round the Forum, first along the west or Tabularium side, then along the north side, etc. On pp. 175-203 we have an account of the buildings adjoining the Sacra Via, from the Templum Faustinae to the Templum Iovis Statoris. From first to last the book is written with a view to use on the spot, in the presence of the monuments.

There is a list of source passages and references to new literature on the Forum (pages 204-211), a list of the 109 illustrations in the text, and three excellent plans.

Taken as a whole the book deserves high praise. Its plan is excellent. The general history of the Forum is given in Part I; the detailed history of the individual buildings is set forth in Part II, in small type, prefixed to the description of the actual remains of each building. Thus the reader is saved from embarrassment as he studies the ruins on the spot; when he needs to know the history of a building as an aid to its reconstruction he can readily find it. Again, the existing ruins are treated, in the main, in topographical sequence. This arrangement is most helpful to one on the spot, indeed, to any reader. The photographs, plans and reconstructions are all most useful. The test of actual use on the ground shows that the book subserves excellently the purposes for which it was written.

Yet there are blemishes. The proof-reading, nay, even the writing in some places, was evidently done with haste and the printing leaves much to be desired.

Of far more consequence, however, is the fact that there are errors in matters wherein errors might have been avoided entirely, at least by one situated so favorably with reference to the Forum as Professor Huelsen is; had the manuscript or the proof-sheets been compared throughout on the spot with the monuments themselves, the defects to which I shall take exception might easily have been wholly obviated. Few students of the Roman

Forum are privileged to visit it frequently; some can never see it. There is, therefore, an especial obligation laid upon those who may see it frequently to be absolutely accurate in their statements of fact: they have no right to mislead their less fortunately situated brethren, who must rely on their eyes.

On page 119 it is stated that on each side of the entrance to the Basilica Aemilia lie five quadrangular rooms, not connected with one another, used as offices, etc. The plan on page 111 shows six quadrangular rooms, of nearly equal dimensions, on each side of the entrance: no account is given by the author of three other much smaller rooms, one at the east end, two at the west, shown in his plan. Now, one clearly sees six large rooms east of the entrance. On the west side it is not so easy to count, since the side walls of the rooms do not here project above the floor of the basilica as they do on the east side. Besides, a sewer here complicates matters. But there are doubtless six large rooms here. Again, on page 115 we read that the south (or Forum) façade of this basilica consisted originally of "14 grossen Bogenöffnungen". Why then does Abb. 49 on page 114 show 16 arches? The plan on page 111 makes provisions for but 14. On page 115 Professor Huelsen gives an inscription found in this building as L· CAESARI· AUGUSTI· F· DIVIN· PRINCIPI IUVENTUTIS COS· DESIG CUM ESSET ANN· NAT· XIII· AUG· SENATUS. As a matter of fact the *ti* of IUVENTUTIS is not visible; *cum* is somewhat broken, and the initial *e* of *esset* is gone.

On page 122 we read that on the southern edge of the open space in the Forum, opposite the Basilica Iulia, are eight large cubical bases which originally carried colossal statues. One can make this total only by counting in the very large structure (40 feet by 20) at the eastern end of this line: but this is described separately on page 123, in very different terms, and is there certainly thought of as independent of the eight of page 122. Nor did the author mean to count in the column of Phocas, for he had already described that on page 81. A glance at Plan I confirms my criticism.

On page 83 an inscription is given as
vindicata reBELLione et africae RESTitutione laetus.

It should rather be given as

vindicata reBELlione et africae reSTITutione laetus.

On the same page we read of a metrical inscription said to consist of two pieces of stone and to read

a]rmpotens Libycum defendit Honorius [orbem (?)

The inscription really covers three pieces of stone. Again, the *r* of *armipotens*, the *yc* of *Libycum*, the *t* of *defendit*, and the *s* of *Honorius* are not now on the stones. In fact, only the left stroke of the *u* in *Honorius* is clear. We should therefore print

ar]mipotens Lib[yc]um defendi[t] Honoriu[s orbem (?)

On page 85 it is stated that the animals of the so-called rostra reliefs are "um den Leib geschmückt". This is true only of the *sus* and the *taurus*. So on the other suovetaurilian relief still visible in the Forum it seems highly probable that the sheep was not "um den Leib geschmückt", though here the body of the *taurus* overlaps that of the *ovis* in such fashion that absolute certainty is perhaps not attainable.

In one or two cases the author's taste may be called into question. On pages 66, 67 in seeking to account for the great size of the rostra (the one with the hemicyclium, by the Schola Xantha, the Umbilicus and the Arch of Septimius) Professor Huelsen states that often many persons beside the speaker were on the rostra. By way of proof, seemingly, he paraphrases two passages from ancient writers. The latter of these deals with the funeral of Pertinax in 193 A. D., and takes up a full page of small type, yet, as Professor Huelsen describes the scene, there is no proof at all that any one except Severus ascended the rostra. Why abuse the reader's patience thus with impertinent matter?

On page 52 the author calls the more northerly of the two *porticus* on the north or Sacra Via side of the Basilica Iulia "die Vorhalle" of the Basilica. This term seems to me unfortunate, for its use destroys, at least to my mind, that impression of symmetry which the actual remains of this basilica make on one who sees them, for this description gives us but one *porticus* on the north side of the central hall, whereas there are two *porticus* on each of the other sides. Exigencies springing out of the limited extent of ground at the disposal of the builder of this basilica compelled him to set the floor of the northernmost portico on a level lower than that of the other porticoes and the main hall (had he not done this, he must have made the basilica considerably smaller, in order to find room for a long, high stairway from the Sacra Via), but this would not have interfered seriously, if at all, with the impression of symmetry made by the whole on the observer, when the building was intact, whether he stood within the central hall or on any of the surrounding streets. I may note that Professor Huelsen's language is none too clear here, but my interpretation of the phrase "die Vorhalle" is confirmed by his use of the same term, on page 109, in connection with the Basilica Aemilia; there his meaning is unmistakable.

In several places passages might be rewritten with great gain in clearness. This is especially true of pages 88, 89, which seek to describe the so-called rostra reliefs. The buildings which seem to be represented here Professor Huelsen describes from right to left, an unnatural way at best. He is seeking to prove that these buildings give a complete representation of the Forum from the Basilica Iulia, via the west side, to the Basilica Aemilia. Yet, in his detailed description he names the buildings, in each case, from the eastern end in toward the center (or west) side of the whole group, and thus destroys the very impression of sym-

metry which he is trying to create. Further, a sad misprint on page 88 makes matters still worse, for each relief is referred to in turn as "die zweite Schranke". The second "zweiten" on line 23 should be corrected to "ersten". The whole account should be rewritten, and the contents of each relief should be given in sequence from left to right. It might have been well, too, to present proof that these reliefs ever stood on this rostra. Cf. above, p. 216.

On page 61, speaking of the much-discussed arches back (west) of the Schola Xantha, Professor Huelsen says, "hat man neuerdings vermutet, der Bau sei die von Caesar ans Ostende des Forums verlegte Rostra gewesen". Now, since these arches are at the west end of the Forum, I fail to see how any one could ever have fancied them to be part of a structure built at the east end. The author has written hastily, it would seem, and in too Tacitean a fashion; he means, I take it, "hat man neuerdings vermutet, der Bau sei mit den von Caesar verlegten Rostra identisch, aber diese waren ans Ostende verlegt". My correction is confirmed by Professor Huelsen's own language on page 124, where he refers to a "Projekt (Caesars), die Rednerbühne an das untere Ende des Markts zu verlegen".

These points and some others like them are in themselves not of very great moment, but it is precisely on such small matters that truth and scholarship alike often turn. Of one to whom much has been given much may of right be demanded; the ease with which all errors of fact might have been avoided by the author of this book makes it hard to excuse them. Besides, the book is on the whole so excellent, so helpful, that these shortcomings are all the harder to bear; one feels regret over them, as over *egregio inspersi corpore naevi*.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK.

CHARLES KNAPP.

Classical Mythology in Shakespeare. By ROBERT KILBURN ROOT, Ph. D. A Thesis presented to the Philosophical Faculty of Yale University in Candidacy for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1903. Pp. 134.

The aim of this useful thesis has been to collect and examine the numerous allusions to classical mythology in the authentic works of Shakespeare, with the purpose of determining the sources from which he drew his acquaintance with the matter, the conception which he entertained of it, and the extent to which it became a vital element in his art. The main results of the investigation, and the uses to which they are applied, may be stated in the author's own words (p. 14): 'First, that with few exceptions Shakespeare's allusions to classical mythology have

to do with myths, the substance of which may be found in Ovid or Vergil; secondly, that his employment of these allusions is clearly different at different periods of his work. If these conclusions are accepted, we gain from the first a new sort of internal evidence as to the Shakespearian authorship of a disputed play or portion of a play; from the second a new sort of internal evidence for determining the date of composition of a play known to be Shakespeare's. I shall now consider these tests in some detail'.

The subject of the study is extremely interesting, and on the whole it is very carefully treated. Perhaps the reviewer can best indicate his appreciation and interest by suggesting a number of additions and corrections.

Dr. Root is usually content to show that a mythological allusion can be explained from Ovid. In this part of his work he might have noted: p. 39, that the names Boreas and Aquilon both occur in Ovid; p. 90, that Nemesis is three times mentioned in Ovid (under the name Rhamnusia or Rhamnusia); p. 110, that there is more about Tantalus in Ovid than his comment implies; p. 96, that Ovid seems to connect Perseus and Pegasus, *Am. 3. 12. 24*: 'victor Abantiades alite fertur equo'.

Of the influence of Seneca Dr. Root finds 'but two possible instances, neither of which is conclusive' (p. 5). To these two he might perhaps have added three other passages which he has been unable to explain from Ovid, namely, the allusions to Prometheus, to Hercules, and to the Sirens, which are mentioned in the next two paragraphs. And the statement that Orpheus 'drew floods' (p. 93) gets as much support from Seneca, *Herc. Fur. 573*, *Herc. Oet. 1040*, as from Horace, *Od. 1. 12. 9*.

It would be interesting to know how many of Shakespeare's allusions could be explained from the little handbook of mythology which goes under the name of Hyginus. This was printed at Basel in 1535. Much of the matter is derived from the Greek drama, and in view of *Fables 107, 144, 30*, it may not be necessary to go direct to Sophocles or Horace for the story of Ajax slaughtering sheep or cattle; to Aeschylus (*Prometheus Freed?*) or Seneca (*Med. 709*) for the picture of Prometheus 'tied to Caucasus'; to Euripides (*Herc. Fur. 396*) for the idea that Hercules slew the dragon and gathered the golden apples himself. For this exploit of Hercules, see also *Apoll. Rhod. 4. 1434-40*, Seneca, *Agam. 852*, Boccaccio, *Amorosa Visione, 26*, and Chaucer, *Monkes Tale, 111*, with Professor Skeat's note (p. 231). The three myths which Dr. Root mentions (p. 3) as evidence that Shakespeare was acquainted with Ovid's *Heroides* are all told quite as fully in Hyginus.

There is good classical authority for the blindness of Cupid in Theocritus, *10. 19*: 'Love is blind no less than Plutus'. In a little poem attributed to Vergil, *Poet. Lat. Min. ed. Baehrens. 4. 160*, we have not only the phrase 'caecus Amor', but also a men-

tion of the arrow with the golden head—'aurata cuspidē telum'. And there is at least a suggestion of 'Siren tears' in Seneca, Herc. Oet. 190: 'ubi fata gemam Thessala Siren'. Compare the Sirens of Dositheus 'propter raptum Proserpinae lamentantes' (quoted in M. Schmidt's edition of Hyginus, on Fab. 141), and the sculptured Sirens on certain Attic tombs, one of them 'beating her breast and tearing her hair' (Harrison and Verrall, *Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens*, pp. 582-5). See also Euripides, *Hel.* 169.

The source of the story of Achilles and Telephus, p. 3, is not quite accurately stated. Dictys Cretensis does not mention any details about the rust of the spear; and his apocryphal *Journal of the Trojan War* can hardly be called the primary authority for anything which is found in Ovid, Hyginus, and Pliny. It is not very clear what is meant by the 'late Roman conception' of the three Fates, p. 60; or by the 'late Roman tradition' of Cupid, p. 48.

Perhaps one bit of mythology which Dr. Root discusses should be described as 'Italianate'. The disputed passage about 'the morning's love', *Mids.* 3. 2. 389, is aptly compared with Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*, 3. 1464:

'And eek the sonne Tytan gan he chyde,
And seyde, "O fool, wel may men thee dispyse,
That hast the Dawing al night by thy syde"', etc.

Professor Skeat remarks that Chaucer has confused *Tytan* with *Tithonus*, but Boccaccio has the same fancy, in the fourth song of his *Ameto*: 'Come Titan del seno dell' aurora Esce', etc. Compare also Marlowe's *Hero and Leander*, 5. 5, 'That day Aurora double grace obtain'd Of her love Phoebus', Greene's *Tritameron of Love*, '*Aurora* had forsaken the waterie bed of her lover *Tytan*', and Lodge's *Rosalynde*, 'The sunne was no sooner stept from the bed of *Aurora*', etc.

Something more might have been said about the classical mythology of other Elizabethan writers, or of their English predecessors. The conceit 'bright Apollo's lute strung with his hair' need not be laid to Shakespeare's charge, if we read in Lyly, *Midas* 4. 1, 'had thy lute been of lawrell, and the strings of Daphnes haire'. Lyly's Syren has 'golden lockes', and sings 'with a Glasse in her hand and a Combe', Love's *Metamorphosis* 4. 2. In *Meas.* 3. 2, 47: 'What, is there none of Pygmalion's images, newly made woman, to be had now, for putting the hand in the pocket and extracting it clutched?' the turn of the phrase is probably due to the beginning of Lyly's *Anatomy of Wit*: 'A woman so exquisite that . . . Pigmalions Image was not halfe so excellent, having one hande in hys pocket as notinge their thefte', etc. With the spear of Achilles, 'able to kill and cure', *H 6 B* 5. 1. 100, we may compare Lyly's *Cooling Carde* for Philautus (1578), 'Achilles speare could as well heale as hurte'. It has

recently been suggested (in the *Nineteenth Century*, Feb. 1904) that Shakespeare was here borrowing from Pettie's translation of Guazzo's *Civile Conversation* (1581). But Chaucer knew of this 'queynte spere' long before Pettie: see the *Squieres Tale* 239-40. And Dante had mentioned it, *Inf.* 31. 4, long before Guazzo. It is mentioned also in R. Greene's *Tullies Love*, and in T. Lodge's *Rosalynde*. If Shakespeare makes 'the Hesperides' the name of the garden, so did Greene and others: see Greene's *Orlando Furioso*, with Dyce's note, p. 90. But is 'this fair Hesperides' in *Per.* 1. 1. 27 the name of the garden? Cupid's 'arrow with the golden head' is mentioned in Thomas Preston's *Cambises* 849, 'the shaft of love, that beares the head of golde'. Sidney refers to the madness of Ajax, in his *Apologie for Poetrie*: 'let but *Sophocles* bring you *Ajax* on a stage, killing and whipping Sheepe and Oxen, thinking them the Army of Greeks', etc. The expression 'Siren tears', in *Sonn.* 119, has its parallel at the beginning of T. Lodge's *Rosalynde*:

'The Syrens teares doe threaten mickle grieve'.

And the 'famous Shakespearian crux' about 'Juno's swans', in *As.* 1. 3. 77, may be compared with Thomas Kyd's *Soliman and Perseda* 4. 1. 70:

'I should haue deemd them *Junoos* goodly Swannes'.

HAVERFORD COLLEGE,
HAVERFORD, PA.

WILFRED P. MUSTARD.

REPORTS.

HERMES XXXIX.

Fascicle 1.

Ovid und Nikander (E. Bethe). Bethe, continuing his study of Antoninus Liberalis (cf. A. J. P. XXV p. 472), compares his excerpts from Nicander's *Ἑρεποιούμενα* with Ovid's *Met.* V 302-678. Some of the discrepancies are easily explained, others are probably due to Antoninus' incorporating scholia from a learned edition of Nicander. As *Anton.* c. 24 and c. 28 must be combined with c. 9, it becomes evident that Ovid owed also his form to Nicander, who was evidently a better poet than is usually believed. Ovid's use of a mythological schoolbook for the general scheme of his *Metamorphoses* has been more definitely determined by Bethe's pupil H. Kienzle in his dissertation '*Ovidius qua ratione compendium mythologicum ad Metamorphoseis componendas adhibuerit*' (Basel 1903).

Das Lebensziel der Skeptiker (Max Pohlenz). According to Sextus, the *τέλος* of the Skeptics was twofold: *ἐποχή* and consequent *ἀταραξία* in matters pertaining to the reason; but *μετριοπάθεια* in the domain of sense; for recognizing the reality of sense perception, they only aimed at moderating the *κατηραγκασμένα πάθη* by avoiding the *δόξα* that they were evil. This duality is remarkable when contrasted with the unity sought for in the other systems of philosophy, especially as the Skeptics had adopted elements from the Epicureans and Stoics. P. traces the Skeptic *τέλος*, as defined by Sextus and Diogenes, back through Aenesidemus to Timon, who seems to have developed the idea of the *μετριοπάθεια* as a defense against the charge that *ἀνεργησία* must result from the absolute *ἀπάθεια* taught by Pyrrhon. The latter was himself influenced by Democritus. Though similar to the Cyrenaic system, Pyrrhon's skepticism shows a nearer approach to the Cynic school, at least, superficially. For the Cynics were combative and all that that implied, while Pyrrhon was quiescent, retiring, sparing of words. Hence Aristotle's words (*Eth. Nic.* 1104 b 24) *διὸ καὶ ὀρίζονται τὰς ἀπερὸς ἀπαθείας τινὰς καὶ ἡρεμίας* (cf. *Eth. Eud.* 1222 a 1) point to Pyrrhon, not to the Cynics (Zeller II 1⁴ p. 312 n. 2), to whom *ἡρεμία*, a technical term of the Skeptics, would not apply. This is possible, as Pyrrhon may have been born as early as 375 B. C. He was the first to set up *ἀπάθεια* as the *τέλος* of life; but his followers failed to maintain the pure doctrine, and so it fell to the dogmatic Zeno to give fixity to the term with new content.

Neue Studien zur Überlieferung und Kritik der Metamorphosen Ovids (Hugo Magnus). This is a continuation of a series of articles beginning 1891 in *Fleckeisens Jahrb.* and aims at a revision of Ovid's text, based on the two oldest (XI century)

MSS M and N which contain Met. I-XIV and represent a common original O, which is, so far as it can be reconstructed, the best source. However, as all the correct readings in the late interpolated MSS (s) cannot be conjectures of the Itali, we must recognize a tradition independent of O. Unfortunately no single MS in this class is representative; hence the necessity of extreme caution. Magnus describes his critical method and presents a number of emendations. Among the points discussed may be noted Ovid's practice in omitting *est*, the history of *redivivus* and the frequency with which Vergil's usage has contaminated the poorer MSS.

Livius und Horaz über die Vorgeschichte des römischen Dramas (Friedrich Leo). While heartily approving Hendrickson's work (A. J. P. XV 1 ff. XIX 285 ff.) on the history of the Roman drama as sketched in Livy VII 2. and Horace Ep. II 1. 139 ff., Leo shows that these accounts, though ultimately determined by Aristotle, are radically different. Livy shows elsewhere that he was indeed familiar with Varro's chronology of Andronicus; but in VII 2 he followed some annalist, and thus represents the development as more purely Roman. Horace makes the Greek influence prominent, and, still more familiar with Varro's work, probably from his school books, attacks Varro's aesthetic norms, while following the mistaken chronology of Accius, which places Andronicus' first play in 197 B. C., a clear indication that his source was pre-Varronian. The term *satura* is not used in Livy VII 2 in the sense of *λαμβική ιδέα*, derived from Lucilius' aggressiveness in order to parallel the *ἀρχαία κωμῳδία* (see A. J. P. XV 11); but may perhaps have the Ennian meaning of medley. The existence of a "dramatic" *satura* is less likely than ever; certainly Varro may no longer be cited as an authority, and as Livy does not reflect Varro's work, we must form a different conception of his 'de scaenicis originibus.'

Note sur une Inscription de Magnésie (Maurice Holleaux). This is a tentative restoration of lines 73-94 of one of the 'perles de l'admirable recueil qui fait tant d'honneur à la science et à la conscience de M. Otto Kern et de ses collaborateurs'. (See O. Kern, *Inschr. von Magnesia am Maeander*, nr. 105, p. 95 ff.; Dittenberger, *Sylloge*, n. 929.)

Chronologische und historische Beiträge zur griechischen Geschichte der Jahre 370-364 v. Chr. (Benedictus Niese). The chronology of this period hinges largely on the dates assigned to Epaminondas' second invasion of the Peloponnesus and to the second expedition sent by Dionysius I. In opposition to Grote, Bury, Beloch, Meyer, etc., Niese defends the chronology of Dodwell, which was adopted by Clinton and Thirlwall. There is no warrant to modify the well authenticated account of the trial of Epaminondas and colleagues for overstaying their term of office in 369 B. C., and so this very trial implies that they were not elected for that year, and it is clear as Xenophon's words

τῷ ὑστέρῳ ἔτει (Hell. VII 1, 1.) indicate, that Epaminondas' second Peloponnesian campaign took place in 368 B. C. Contemporaneous events corroborate this date, and indeed the longer interval between the first and second expedition of Epaminondas is necessary for an intelligible development of affairs. Historians would probably have been unanimous on this point had they not followed G. R. Sievers (Gesch. Griech. v. Ende des pelopon. Krieg. bis zur Schlacht bei Mantinea p. 277 ff. 395) in placing the death of Dionysius I in the winter of 368/7 B. C. Niese points out the unreliable character of their authority (Diod. XV 74) and gives weighty reasons for assigning D.'s death to the summer of 367 B. C. and his second expedition a little earlier. Contemporaneous and succeeding events fit into this scheme admirably, an important consideration in view of the few reliable dates. The discussion throws light on the military organization of Thessaly, upon Dionysius I, Jason of Pherae and their relations with the rest of Greece, as well as upon the character of the sources: Xenophon, Plutarch, Diodorus, etc. The founding of Megalopolis in 367 B. C. was the result of the Tearless Victory (see A. J. P. XXI 98).

Die handschriftliche Grundlage der Schrift *περὶ ἀέρων ὑδάτων τόπων* (J. L. Heiberg). This interesting document, which includes a discussion of the comparative ethnography of Europe and Asia, and is classed among the genuine works of Hippocrates by Christ (Gr. Lit. p. 854) is ascribed by Heiberg to an unknown peregrinating physician of the fifth century B. C. A critical examination of the sources leads to a new estimate of their relative value; especially important is the recognition of the great value of the old Latin translation preserved in cod. Paris. lat. 7027 saec. X. Unfortunately little use has been made of it in the new critical edition (Hippocratis opera quae feruntur omnia vol. I, rec. H. Kühlewein, Lipsiae 1894, p. 31-71).

Ein neues "Urtheil Salomonis" und die Friesbilder der Casa Tiberina (R. Engelmann). E. discusses the Pompeian wall-painting known as the Judgment of Solomon (see Mau's Pompeii Fig. 6) and similar pictures, one of which he discovers through a clever interpretation of an engraving by Bellori, which is reproduced. He also essays the interpretation of the 'judgments' represented on the frieze of the Casa Tiberina and concludes that Robert may be right in regarding these as illustrations of a Greek romance (see A. J. P. XXIII p. 336); but, if so, well-known subjects were selected, for it is probable that, like other popular tales, stories of clever judgments were current in Greece as well as in Egypt and the Orient.

Miscellen.—F. Bechtel and F. Blass, independently, have concluded that the Homeric *τῶν λεγῶν* should be written *ἀν λεγῶν*, thus producing a word similar in meaning to *δυσληγῶν* (χ 325). The τ is probably due to the diaskeuasts, who sought to remove the hiatus.—Geo. Wissowa questions the view of Domaszewski

(Jahreshefte des österr. arch. Inst. VI 1903 p. 57 ff.), that the sacrificial procession represented on the Ara Pacis was held at the constitutio 13 B. C. rather than at the dedicatio 9 B. C. Wissowa holds that the latter, also called the consecratio, constituted the natalis of the structure and was the really important event.

Fascicle 2.

Toga und Trabea (W. Helbig). The purple cloak with scarlet border known as the *trabea* is usually regarded as an ancient military cloak. The Roman consul had to wear it—*cinctu Gabinio*—when at the beginning of a campaign he opened the doors of the temple of Janus, the Salian priests wore it when executing their war dance and it was the uniform of the equites. But it was also prescribed for certain priests, of whom the flamen dialis was forbidden to even look at an armed force. Monumental and literary evidence yield the following explanation. The *trabea* from *trabs* or *trabes* was the striped toga anciently worn by the king and distinguished citizens, introduced under the Etruscan dynasty and analogous to the later *toga praetexta*; but more brilliant and of varied colors, as to be expected at an earlier stage of civilization, the stripes perhaps forming a geometric pattern. Of moderate size, it required fibulae as fastenings and was worn at all times, although in war it was arranged with the *cinctus Gabinus*. A gradual increase in the dimensions and change in shape, partly under Hellenic influence, evolved the later toga—whose ample folds made it necessarily a garb of peace (cf. Thucyd. I 6, 2). The color, however, seems to have been modified suddenly, when in the new-born republic the consuls were forbidden to wear the *trabea* with its royal purple, except as mentioned above, and so the *toga praetexta* became a substitute. The attire of the priests had to correspond, while the independence of the equites and Salian priests preserved for them the ancient *trabea*.

Die Grundzüge der Heraklitischen Physik (Adolf Brieger). Passing in review the fragments of Heraclitus and their critics, with illuminating discussions and plausible interpretations, Brieger tries to present a view, necessarily imperfect, of H.'s cosmology. The obscurity of H. is due not merely to his style (Diels); but also to his Ionic mysticism. Diels is skeptical in regard to all attempts at reconstructing H.'s system; but Alois Patin has proved, at least, that a large number of the sayings may have composed a connected text. No doubt there were gaps; but these were due to H.'s neglect of details. The *πῦρ* was a 'Wärme-stoff', which marks an advance on the *ἀήρ* of Anaximenes, and he deserves credit for emphasizing and developing the idea of eternal motion, which, indeed, was implied in the previous Ionic systems. Every object, like a river, is in perpetual flux, mechanically conceived, in which sense H. made statements as: *ταῦτόν εἶναι καὶ οὐκ εἶναι*. Similar contradictions are based on his doctrine of relativity: *θάλασσα ὕδωρ . . . ἰχθύσι μὲν πότιμον . . . ἀνθρώποις δὲ ἄποτον*.

Both of these ideas were adopted from H. by Democritus, like whom H. held sound views on sense perception (cf. A. J. P. XXIV p. 344). The meeting of opposites produces war, the father of all things, and there results harmony. This idea gave a great impulse to human thought. The greatest defect in H.'s system is the lack of an explanation how things are produced out of the *πῦρ*. He probably did not distinguish between qualitative and mechanical change; but we can only imagine his teaching the latter. The serious defects in the cosmology should not detract from the fame of one whose influence can be seen in Democritus, Plato and the Stoics, whose kindred spirit Ed. Pfeiderer has found in Spinoza.

Die Entstehung der Olympionikenliste (Alfred Körte). K. follows Mahaffy (Jour. of Hell. St. II, 164 ff., Prob. in Gk. Hist.) in trying to prove that Hippias' chronology of the Olympic games, preserved chiefly in Julius Africanus, was not based on an official list; but was boldly constructed and conjectured from scattered records. The Olympic games like those at Delphi, etc. were originally funeral games, hence there must have been chariot racing and other contests from the earliest times, as is proved by Homer, Pindar, Bacchylides and the clay and bronze figures of two-horse chariots found in and south of the Heraion at Olympia. The account of a gradual introduction of the various contests is therefore false. Further defects are the omission of the *ἀπὴν* and *κάλπη* (cf. Paus. V 9, 1), the disregard of the Anolympiads (cf. Paus. VI 22, 3) and the prominence given to the *στάδιον* race, where others recorded victors in the *πένταθλον*. Thucydides knew no such list and it is certain that none was made in Delphi until the IV century, all of which justifies Plutarch's adverse criticism (Numa 1). For the hundred and fifty years preceding Hippias' time the traditional list is probably accurate; but the earlier record is wholly unreliable and '776 B. C. the first Olympiad' is no more reliable than '1068 [1066] Codrus dies for his fatherland'.

Der historische Kern des III. Makkabäerbuches (Hugo Willrich). The III Bk. of Maccabees, Bk. of Esther, and Josephus' Against Apion II 5, have in common the theme how an important Jewish diaspora was miraculously delivered from a heathen oppressor. This was Ptolemy Physkon (146-117 B. C.) in Josephus' legendary account; but the historic basis of this is to be found in the time of Ptolemy Soter II, also nicknamed Physcon, who, when recalled by the Alexandrians (87 B. C.) found himself in opposition to Cleopatra III and the Jews. The peaceful outcome gave rise to a Jewish festival and the Physcon legend. A similar festival known as the Nicanor day, established by Judas Maccabaeus, was observed in Jerusalem. Thereupon, about 50 B. C., was established the feast of Purim, which appears as a result of a religious compromise made between the Jews of Palestine and those of Alexandria, at a time when they felt drawn

together politically. It thus became a festival for all Jews and was legitimized by the book of Esther, which is merely a variant of the Physcon legend. Finally in the time of Caligula, who undertook to persecute the Jews in Palestine and Egypt, was composed the III Bk. of Maccabees, which developing the Physcon legend represented the persecution and deliverance as taking place under Ptolemy Philopator (221-204 B. C.).

De Aeneidis libro III (H. T. Karsten). The much debated question as to the composition of the Aeneid centres round Bk. III, which some consider the first written, others would assign to a later date. The latter view has recently been set forth by R. Heinze (*Virgils Epische Technik*), against whom especially, K. directs his arguments. K. thinks Vergil's initial plan was in so far definite as to include the journey to Italy and the wars with the natives. So he wrote our Bk. III (excepting the end and v. 341), which he put into verse about 28 B. C. But his plan widened and he took up the Dido episode, etc., and to control the accumulating material he made a disposition of the whole in prose, to which Donatus refers. In order to fit Bk. III into this enlarged scheme it was necessary to change the end; but minor discrepancies were left, never to be eliminated. K. believes that Bk. V preceded Bk. VI.

Collationen aus einem geometrischen Tractat (M. Manitius).

Miscellen.—F. Skutsch argues that as Plautus did not follow Diphilos' *κληρούμενοι* in ending his *Casina* so he composed a new prologue from various sources, which explains the inappropriateness of the verses 81 ff. which question the chastity of *Casina*. Diphilos wrote his play not very long after the death of Alexander as the *humani Joves* (*Cas.* 328 ff.) prove.—M. Ihm calls attention to the occurrence of 'arcus triumphalis' in the commentarius in LXXV psalmos, found among the writings of Rufinus, but the work of the fifth century monk Vincentius. Hülsen has recently shown the late use of this term, and so if Bondurand's reading *ARCVM. TRIVM.* on the arch at Orange is correct, it may date from the IV century A. D.—E. Hultsch discusses the Indian dialect found in the *Oxyrhynchus Pap.* 413 (Part III) and the early intercourse between India and the Occident.—E. Herkenrath gives an analysis of Pindar's Nemean Ode IX.—O. Schroeder explains how Pindar's *κεφαλᾶν πολλῶν νόμον* (*Pyth.* 12) may indeed refer to the serpent-headed Gorgons; but probably characterized the variety of rhythm and content of the *Ἀθηνᾶς νόμος*, which was a counterpart of the famous Pythian nome.

HERMAN L. EBELING.

PHILOLOGUS, Bd. LXII (N. F. Bd. XVI), 1903.

I, pp. 1-34. W. Schmid: Probleme aus der sophokleischen *Antigone*. Kaibel's interpretation criticized and refuted. The poet's aim (p. 6) is no other than to present the last act of the fall

of the Labdakidae and also (departing from the mythological tradition) the glorious fall in the struggle for a noble cause. The idea underlying the play is *ὅσια πανουργεῖν* (v. 74). The key to the understanding of the play is in the conception of Kreon's character and the irony with which it is treated (p. 5). Kreon is conceived as the embodiment of the spirit of the sophist (p. 12). Antigone represents *μεγαλοψυχία*, and is actuated by *φιλοδοξία*, and *εὐσέβεια* (p. 5-7). Ismene, a sympathetic woman, represents *σωφροσύνη* (i. e. *ἡσυχιότης*) (p. 4). Haemon (p. 31) has two functions in the structure of the drama. (1) Ethopoetic: to throw into still more unsympathetic light the character and actions of his father, who so insolently admonishes his good, obedient son and drives him to death. (2) Constructive: by his relation to Antigone to involve his father together with himself in the heroine's ruin. As regards the question of interpolation, the final speech of Antigone should end with verse 904 (p. 34).

II, pp. 35-38. R. Herzog: Zur Geschichte des Mimus. A terra-cotta lamp (C. Watzinger, Athen. Mitt. XXVI, 1901, p. 1 ff. with plate I) is of importance in connection with the history of literature. The conclusion (p. 37) is that the lamp was of Alexandrian ware, or from an Alexandrian mould; that the minor arts at Alexandria in the century of Theokritos and Herondas had connection with the dramatic mime, and that the latter was in full activity there.

III, pp. 39-63. P. Egenolff: Zu Lentz' Herodian III. E. treats of book XX *περὶ χρόνων* and *περὶ πνευμάτων*, adding new material for interpreting and criticizing the text.

IV, pp. 64-86. Edwin Müller: Zur Charakteristik des Manilius. Manilius' imitations of other writers used so as to correct the text.

V, pp. 87-90. L. Gurlitt: Textrettungen zu Ciceros Briefen (Ad fam. VIII 17 fin.; IX, 6, 6; IX 7, 2). Read in Cael. ad Cic. VIII 17 fin., Ergo me potius in Hispania fuisse tum, quam Formiis, quom tu profectus es ad Pompeium!—quod utinam!—aut (sc. utinam fuisset) Appius Claudius in ista parte, C. Curio, quouis amicitia me paulatim in hanc perditam causam imposuit! In ad fam. IX 6, 6, he justifies *iure* against the suspicions of the editors. In ad fam. IX 7, 2 reads: ego omnino magis arbitror per Siciliam, vel iam sciemus—gaining besides an agreeable *clausula*.

VI, pp. 91-94. E. Samter: Die Bedeutung des Beschneidungsritus und Verwandtes. H. Gunkel in Archiv f. Papyrusforschung II 20 failed to see the motives underlying Ezekiel 32. Circumcision was a dedicatory rite which appeased the family gods and then in general the gods of the world below. Hence a circumcised warrior, if he fell, was assured a better lot in the world of the dead.

VII, pp. 95-124. G. A. Gerhard and O. Gradenwitz: Glosierte Paulusreste im Zuge der Digesten. Heidelberg Papyrus MS 1272. Two plates. Text with several Greek glosses of Dig.

V. 2. L. 16-19. Pp. 111-124 are occupied by a discussion of the legal points. The glosses show us that the Digests were used in Egypt and provided with glosses, which were by no means always correct.

VIII, pp. 125-140. O. Crusius: Kleinigkeiten zur alten Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte.

I. ΕΛΑΦΟΣΤΙΚΤΟΣ. ΛΑΓΟΒΙΟΣ. I. Lysias XIII 19. εἰσπέμπουσι γὰρ εἰς τὴν βουλὴν . . . Θεόκριτον τὸν τοῦ Ἐλαφoστίκτου καλούμενον. The bearer of the nick-name Ἐλαφoστίκτος was once a runaway slave who had been tattooed with the figure of a deer. II. The name Λαγόβιος (Suidas II p. 483 Bh.) is also a nick-name for a runaway slave, derived from the proverb λαγὼ βίον ζῇ (cf. Demosth. de cor. 263, Dio Chrys. 66, 24, Luc. Somn. 9). Compare χαλκὰ ἔντερα ἔχει and χαλκέντερος, etc. λαγὼς like ἔλαφος becomes the type of the easily frightened runaway slave.

2. Latin script in Greek texts. Besides the instance cited by Norden (Die antike Kunstprosa I 60³) from Didymos Alex. de trinitate I 15 in a cod. Vat. s. XI and another by Krumbacher (Byz. Ztsch. VII (1898) 468) from Prokopios' Gothic wars, ed. Comparetti I 177. 2, Crusius adds 3 from Zosimos, V 29, p. 254 Mendels. V 41 p. 271, VI 11 p. 392; and 12 from Jo. Laurentius Lydus de Mag. I 24 p. 46 Fuss (140 Bekker), I 25 (bis), I 26, I 35, I 38, I 42, I 47, I 50, II 3, III 3, III 8. During the first centuries of the Christian era, the Greeks even when, like Plutarch, they treated of Roman affairs, altogether avoided the Latin script. The first examples of the use in literature occur in the fourth century, a time when the Greek east began to lose its peculiar Hellenic national feeling, and consider itself the superior representative of the Roman empire. But no instances have been cited from works of free artistic manner. For the Roman custom cf. Cic. Tusc. I 8, 15 and the different usage in the Latin and Greek letters of Fronto and M. Aurelius, and contrast the manner of the sermo cottidianus.

IX, pp. 141-154. S. Brandt: Entstehungszeit und zeitliche Folge der Werke von Boethius. This first paper details the attempts of others to solve the problem, and begins to set forth the data. Continued in XIV p. 234-275.

Miscellen.—1. pp. 155-157. O. Hoffmann: Nochmals die Sotairos-Inschrift. Reply to Bechtel's criticism (Hermes XXXVII 631 ff.) of his interpretation in Philol., 1902, N. F. XV 245 ff. 2. pp. 157-160. G. Kazarow: Der liparische Kommunistenstaat. Upholds against L. Stein (Die Sociale Frage im Lichte der Philosophie s. 180 f.) the opinion expressed by Pöhlmann (Gesch. des antiken Kommunismus u. Socialismus Bd. I. 46 f.) that the remarkable communistic state on Lipara pictured by Diodorus V 9, is not to be considered a reminiscence of an original communism on the part of emigrants from Rhodes and Knidos but is to be explained by the peculiar situation in which the islanders were placed.

X, pp. 161-181. O. Schroeder: *Pindarica*. V, Aeolic Strophes. Metrical analysis of some strophes in aeolic style (Nem. 2, Isthm. 8, Pyth. 8 (strophe and epode), Pyth. 7 (str. and ep.), Isthm. 7 (str. and ep.), Pyth. II str. 4^b and ep. Then Sch. examines more difficult cases (Nem. 4 and 7, Pyth. 5, Ol. 2).

XI, pp. 182-195. Fr. Staehlin: *Der Dioskurenmythus in Pindars 10. nemeischer Ode*. An example of the idealization of a myth. Summary p. 194. Pindar has changed over the story as given in the Kypria into a new thrilling myth and undertaken to refine it in a two-fold manner. Polydeukes appears superhuman and stainless. Kastor is freed as much as possible from the charge of cattle-lifting and entirely from that of lying in ambush. There is a sharp contrast between the immortal nature of the god and the mortality of the brother, bridged over by the generosity of the god in parting with half of his divinity. Hence the point of the ode is: As Polydeukes the god showed Kastor the utmost loyalty, so both the deified Tyndarids now keep faith with the descendants of Pamphaes—if they are devout, as Kastor, according to Pindar's version, was devout and innocent.

XII, pp. 196-226. Fr. Beyschlag: *Das XXXII. Kapitel der platonischen Apologie*. Summary on p. 225. The points of view adduced by von Bamberg to establish his rejection of this chapter are insufficient; in fact this chapter is shown on closer study to be even more closely connected with its context than is apparent at first sight. An analysis of the thought of the passage has shown still further that in it thoroughly Platonic-Socratic expressions and train of thought are demonstrable. But its authenticity is made certain also by the external evidence of imitation by Cicero and Xenophon and by a direct reference to it by Plato (Phaed. 63 B ff.).

XIII, pp. 227-233. K. Praechter: *Textkritisches zu Chariton*.

XIV, pp. 234-275. S. Brandt: *Entstehungszeit und zeitliche Folge der Werke von Boethius*. Summary p. 267 ff. The works before 510 (perhaps from 500 on) Arithmetic, Music, Geometry (?) (Astronomy?) perhaps Physics, and also both commentaries on Porphyrius. In the year 510 (511) the commentaries on the Categories. The rest are after 510 (511). The *Consolatio* was written in 523 and 524.

XV, pp. 276-291. O. Apelt: *Bemerkungen zu Plutarchs Moralia*.

XVI, pp. 292-305. B. Sepp: *Der Codex Pontani in Leyden*. Attempt to show by a comparison of the readings of this MS (=b) of Tacitus' *Germania* and *Dialogus* and Suet. *de gram.* that in March, 1460 Pontanus copied cod. Leidensis XVIII Perizonianus c. 21 (=b) from cod. Vat. 1862 (=B), itself a copy from the archetype brought to Rome in 1455 by Henoch of Ascoli.

XVII, pp. 306-319. F. Luterbacher: *Die Chronologie des Hannibalzugs*. (On the third book of Polybius.) Defence of his

views published in *Philol.* 60, 307-314 as to how the 15 days of Hannibal's crossing are to be reckoned, and that the passage was made in October. The objections raised by Osiander *Philol.* 61, 473-476 are refuted. Excursus (pp. 315-319) on Saguntum and Rome.

Miscellen.—3. p. 320. G. Knaack: Zu Prokopios ep. 96.

XVIII, pp. 321-338. C. Hentze: Das Auftreten der Iris im zweiten, dritten und fünften Gesange der Ilias. Summary pp. 337-338. In *Γ* as in the *Kypria*, Iris appears without her original connection with Zeus and in the service of no other divinity. She serves as a sort of poetical figure solely for the purposes of epic action, which in *Γ* seemed to demand that after the introduction of the duel between Paris and Menelaos for ending the war, Helen as the prize of victory in the combat should be presented to the hearers in person and her feelings depicted. In *Β* Iris is indeed introduced as still apparently the messenger of Zeus, but really she has little to tell either Priam or Hektor, that renders her errand necessary or justifies it; and her introduction serves solely the poet's purpose to attach the catalogue of the Trojans to what precedes. Both scenes, which differ from all the remaining Iris-scenes, in the transformation of Iris, show certain points of connection with the *Kypria*.

XIX, pp. 339-347. A. Nikitsky: Die Trierarchie des Chairestratos (on *Isaios* VI 1). The trierarchy of Ch. falls in 365-364 B. C. approximately. We have in this passage an allusion not to any warlike expedition of the Athenians to Sicily, but probably to an embassy to Dionysios I.

XX, pp. 348-356. A. Mommsen: Archonten und Schreiber in attischen Urkunden älterer Zeit. The inscriptions furnish nothing to support the theory of Keil that before Ol. 93 a clerk of the council gave his name to the year—the evidence is rather the contrary.

XXI, pp. 357-387. E. Schweder: Ueber den Ursprung und die ursprüngliche Bestimmung des sogenannten Strassennetzes der Peutingerschen Tafel. The net-work of lines universally taken to be roads were in the prototype of the *Tabula Peutingeriana*, that is on the Roman map of the world, although, if we except later additions, they were given there in much completer form than in the *Tab. P.* However, originally, the lines did not represent roads, and on the numerous copies of the map they were taken by nobody in ancient times to signify roads. These lines were routes of travel, drawn in solely for the sake of the numbers.

XXII, pp. 388-409. C. Mutzbauer: Die Grundbedeutung des Conjunctivs und Optativs und ihre Entwicklung im Griechischen. I. The Subjunctive. Summary p. 409. The result of the investigation is, that the subjunctive everywhere, in independent and dependent sentences still clearly shows its original meaning of "expectation" (*Erwartung*); that all varieties in its use may be easily derived from the fundamental meaning of ex-

pectation; and that on this basis the different combinations of *κεν* and *τιν* with this mode may be naturally explained. Finally it gives the key to the right meaning of a long series of sentences with *εἰ*, which have hitherto been for the most part wrongly understood as dependent questions, or as incomplete periods with apodosis wanting.

XXIII, pp. 410-418. C. Ritter: *Timaos* cap. 1. (a) Relation to the Republic of the recapitulation of a political lecture of Socrates. (b) Significance of the unknown person who was prevented by illness from appearing. (a) Plato wished to make known to the readers of the *Timaos* that he wished to develop again before them his ideas as to the regulation of the state and the education of man. He might have referred them directly to the Republic but he now passes over some important parts of the subject-matter. This may mean that Plato omits what he now no longer cares for, or considers incorrect, but where he recapitulates, he does, in fact, confirm his former views. His ideas or his point of view might very well have changed. (b) Two continuations are explicitly promised in the introduction. The vague mention of a fourth and absent person may be a device of Plato's, to make a tetralogy instead of a trilogy, should he see fit—i. e. *Timaos*, *Kritias*, *Hermocrates* and a dialogue to which no name is assignable.

XXIV, pp. 419-444. G. Lehnert: *Zum Texte der Pseudo-Quintilianischen declamationes maiores*. On page 444 there is a list of the passages examined.

XXV, pp. 445-477. B. Lier: *Topica carminum sepulcralium latinorum*. The consolatory sentiments on Roman tomb-stones are derived from the *Consolationes* and are in verse or prose. They come from a Greek source, especially Greek sepulchral inscriptions and the *Consolationes*. Pars. I. Inscriptions expressing sorrow and mourning. (Continued on pp. 563-603.)

Miscellen.—5. pp. 478-480. P. v. Winterfeld: *Ad Lactantium de ave phoenice*. Disagrees with L. Traube (*Scriptores rerum Meroving.* tom. IV, p. 655. 1) as to the nature of the rhythms in the *vita S. Eligii*. v. W. concludes that this poem will help us to some knowledge of the rhythmic of the Franks of this period. 6. p. 480. J. P. Postgate: *Propertius* IV 1. 31; a personal explanation.

XXVI, pp. 481-488. H. Meltzer: *Ein Nachklang von Königsfetischismus bei Homer?* In *Odyss.* 19, 107-114. In 109 the motive for the divine blessing is "reverence for God"; in 111 and 114 'just and beneficent rule'. *θεουδής* may be from *θεόδδης* or *θεόδφης* (-ής?) from *θεοδφής* with root *duci* "fear". At any rate the King's 'reverence for God' would gain a very vivid content if we were to associate with it the belief that the spirit which dwells in the King would wreak vengeance in case wrong were

done to his fetich-character, as might be illustrated from the customs of lower races.

XXVII, pp. 489-540. C. Ritter: *Bemerkungen zum Philebos*. Analysis of the dialogue (taken from the writer's book, *Platons Dialoge, Inhaltsdarstellungen*, s. 168-170) with interpretative notes.

XXVIII, pp. 541-562. T. Büttner-Wobst, *Der Hiatus nach dem Artikel bei Polybios*. The results are summarized in eight laws (pp. 561-2) ἡ, αἱ, οἱ (except οἱ αὐτοί) not used in hiatus; ὁ only in certain phrases; τοῦ never; τῶ only in τῶ ἔθνεϊ (hiatus avoided by aphaeresis and crasis); τῇ only in τῇ αὐτῇ (avoided also by aphaeresis); after τὸ hiatus is allowed (a) in τὸ ἔθνος, τὸ ἔλαιον (b) before ι, ὁ- and ὐ-, (c) and before proper names (avoided by crasis before ἀ- αὐ- ἐ- ἑ- ὀ-). τὰ allows much the same freedom as τὸ. In citations from other authors or documents Polybios does not adhere to the rules.

XXIX, pp. 563-603. B. Lier: *Topica carminum sepulcralium latinorum*. Pars. II. Continued from p. 445-477. On the inscriptions in which the superstitious are offered some consolation.

XXX, pp. 604-619. E. Hesselmeier: *Das Grab des Marius*. The argument must be based on Cic. de legg. II 22, 56f. (1) Marius was not cremated but interred, on a highway outside the Porta Tiburtina, Nomentana, or Salaria. (2) He was the indirect cause that the gens Cornelia, from Cicero's time on, adopted cremation.

XXXI, pp. 620-625. S. Brandt: *Handschriftliches zu Cicero De Inventionem, Versus Hieronymi ad Augustinum, Augustini ad Hieronymum*. Zu Marius Victorinus De Definitionibus.

XXXII, pp. 626-638. C. Mutzbauer: *Das Wesen des Optativs* (continued from p. 409). Summary on page 638. The fundamental meaning of the optative is wish, out of this was developed the meaning of possibility first for the simple optative and then for the optative with the particles *κεν* or *άν* added. The meaning of concession is as little suited to the mode as that of repetition. Rather, it has everywhere kept the original meaning of "wish" (more or less clearly) and is used in dependent sentences after primary as well as secondary tenses. Accordingly it does not appear for the subjunctive or indicative in dependent sentences after secondary tenses. So in Greek it is never a matter of substitution of mode. Homeric *εἰ*-clauses are never dependent questions.

Miscellen.—7. p. 638. A. Müller: Zu Aristophanes Acharn. 988 on the reading of cod. r. 8. p. 640. M. Manitius: *Handschriftliches zur Anthologia latina*.

Indices, etc.

WILLIAMS COLLEGE.

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

BRIEF MENTION.

In a recent number of the *Revue de Philologie* (1905, p. 56) M. RODIN, when pointing out the many shortcomings of the fourth ed. of CHRIST'S *Griechische Literaturgeschichte* (Munich, Beck) in the matter of bibliography,—there are not a few,—mentions among the rest the American contributors to the lexicography of the orators, Forman, Holmes, Van Cleef. A good index, certainly an exhaustive index, insures the compiler, if not immortality, at least a life as long as that of the study indexed, and as every scholar wishes to be remembered, it is strange that more indexes are not forthcoming. The path of the index-maker is not a primrose path, but it leads to the goal more surely than many more ambitious ascents. No 'harmless drudge' is the index-maker, but rather the begetter of many doctoral dissertations and the saviour of many a doctorand. As for the charge of dulness, one Bonitz would redeem the whole tribe of Crudens and Caravellas and Dunbars. So the appearance of a new index is always a matter of congratulation, and every student of the Attic orators will rejoice that one of the most sensible gaps in our apparatus has been filled by PREUSS, the compiler of the *Index Demosthenicus*, and that Mitchell's unsatisfactory performance may henceforth be discarded for the new *Index Isocrateus* (Teubner). True, the index is not absolutely complete. Proper names are omitted, doubtless, because they are provided for elsewhere, and likewise αὐτός, δέ, ἐκεῖνος, καί, μέν, ὁ ἡ τό, ὅς, οὗτος. εἰμί is incomplete and so is οὐ. Still PREUSS thinks that he has included everything of importance under the two latter heads. Now it so happens that I am especially interested in the oblique cases of αὐτό and αὐτά, which are prevalently *ipsum* and *ipsa*, not *id* and *ea*, and I shall have to go through all Isokrates to find out his usage; and while it is interesting to be told that ἐκεῖνος and οὗτος are too numerous to be counted, one would like to have the graphic evidence of the paucity of ὅδε in comparison with οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος. ὅδε is an index of style. ὅδε is dramatic (A. J. P. XXIII 124). It is to be classed with οὐ μή (A. J. P. XXIII 137). But these omissions do not trouble one seriously, and little errors seem to be inevitable in work of this sort. To pounce on such peccadilloes is the first task that FUHR sets himself when anyone undertakes to register the usage of the orators, and it is well that we have so vigilant a watchdog of the treasury (B. Phil. W. 1 Apr. 1905. Cf. A. J. P. XXV 231). But I remember that some years ago, when one of my Argus-eyed contributors undertook to set VON ESSEN right, he himself

got his correction wrong, A. J. P. IX 255, 5 l. fr. bottom, where for 'η 60, 28 should be α 60, 28' read 'α 60, 28 . . . η 60, 28'; and Nemesis follows so close on the heels of every fault-finder (e. g. A. J. P. III 228, footnote) that I am content to accept the result without further ado and to run my eye down the serried columns of figures, out of which rises the image of that 'superior person', as he is called by one scholar, that 'monster of impeccability', as he is called by another, that 'model of deportment', that Turveydropsical priest of the great goddess, Rhetoric, with his sober offering, his *νηφάλια μελίγματα*, of honey and milk and water, very much water. The constituents are the same as those of Pindar's draught, *μεμιγμένον μέλι λευκῷ σὺν γάλακτι, | κίρναμένα δ' ἔερσ' ἀμφέπει*, and common to the two is the epideictic sphere; so that parallels between Pindar and Isokrates are not infrequent in the history of literature, one of the latest being Conrotte in *Musée Belge*, 15 juillet, 1898. But what a difference in the treatment!

However, though I cleave to Pindar as Pindar cleaves to Herakles (N. 1. 33), I am not going to be tempted by M. CONROTTE or M. Anybody else to enlarge on the similarity of the offices of the two heralds and the dissimilarity of their styles. The only apparatus I shall use for these meditations will be the Index Antiphonteus for the *ἀδρός χαρακτήρ* and the Index Lysiacus for the *ἰσχνὸς χαρακτήρ*, as I did A. J. P. XVI 525. So far as the vocabulary is concerned, the difference between Antiphon and the other two is very marked. More subtle is the difference between Lysias and Isokrates. Antiphon deals with tragedies in everyday life, and we must expect a loftier diction. It is not wholly a question of the old school. We have a right to expect personification in Antiphon, we have a right to expect that the semi-personification produced by the nominatives of abstract nouns shall be relatively more abundant in Antiphon, and we find that it is even so (A. J. P. XX 111). In Isokrates the Index shews comparatively few examples. *λόγος* and *νόμος* do not count, are not to be counted. But *δόξα* occurs but twice, *ἐλπίς* but twice, *νόσος* once, *παιδεία* once, even *τύχη* only twice, so that we are quite prepared for Radford's statistics, who tells us that in the non-forensic speeches non-personal subjects are not used half so often as in Antiphon, that in the forensic speeches he falls below Demosthenes (Radford, p. 5).

In the matter of compounds, a decided gnomon of style, a glance at the so-called *a*-privative compounds would suffice to differentiate Antiphon and Isokrates (Hamilton, *Negative Compounds*, p. 57). The prepositional compounds, if com-

pounds they may be called, would require more analysis, but if one may trust impressions, as one may not, there seems to be a surprising number of compounds with *κατα-* in Isokrates. Is not this a reflection of the dogmatism of the old pedant? But that is a dangerous remark for the present writer to make. The periphrastic *ποιεῖσθαι* is idiomatic enough. It goes back to Father Homer, but there seems to be an immense proportional increment in Isokrates over Antiphon and Lysias. The original *σεμνότης* of it gets lost in the frequency of its use. Surely one would not suspect my old Christian friend, Justin Martyr, of any kind of affectation, and that is the best thing about him. The Index to my edition of the Apologies shows how familiar the idiom is, and one wonders why the Hellenists of an earlier generation prided themselves on noticing it.

The chief thing to notice about Isokrates is the absences. He never offends by 'saliency' (A. J. P. XIV 501) in speech or thought, so that we are positively startled by the homely word *ἀδελφίζειν*, which carries us back to Aristophanes' *μὴ πατέριζε*, a command that comes up to my mind whenever I am expected to say my prayers at the shrine of the late Mr. Pater's style.¹ But *ἀδελφίζειν* occurs in a private speech (XIX 30) of which Isokrates was ashamed in after days, and *κατασκελετεύεσθαι* was wrung out of him by the febrile self-conceit of an old man² (XV 268). It is the absences, then, that are most noticeable, and among these I would put *ἡνίκα*. *ἡνίκα* is, as I have elsewhere expressed it, the relative of *καιρός* as *ὅτε* is the relative of *χρόνος* (Pind. P 1, 48). It is more exact, more picturesque than *ὅτε*. It is not common in the orators, and we are not surprised that it does not occur in Antiphon, but considering the bulk of Isokrates, it is fair to conclude that he suppressed it, as we should suppress 'what time' in favor of 'when'. In the matter of *σχίσω* Isokrates follows the oratorical pattern. To the grammarian of to-day the difference in formation between *ἔξω*, the future of *ἔχειν*, and *σχίσω*, the future of *σχεῖν*, is so evident that it is hard to see why it should ever have been neglected. But it was neglected (A. J. P. XXII 228). *παρασχίσομαι* is too tempting for Lysias, too tempting for Isokrates even; and Bekker has restored it to Antiphon, but, to Blass's disgust, *ἔξω* must contrive a double debt to pay.

Two convenient test words are *ἰθίλω* and *βούλομαι*. They have been test words from Homer's time to this day (A. J. P. XVI 525). Now, according to Van Cleef, there are 38 *ἰθίλω*'s to 36

¹ "The 'delicate blandness' < of Mr. Pater's style > is the product of a stuffy atmosphere." Stephen Gwynn in the Academy, Sept. 21, 1901. Cf. A. J. P. XV 93.

² Cf. Burton, An. of Mel., p. 321 (Am. ed.). Let him take heed, but do not stretch his wits and make a skeleton of himself.

βούλομαι's in Antiphon. In Holmes's Index Lysiacus, if an old count is trustworthy, there are more than three times as many βούλομαι's as ἐθέλω's. In Isokrates I decline to count. A foot-rule answers every purpose. There are over nine inches of βούλομαι's and two of ἐθέλω's. That is near enough. *χρή* beats *δεῖ* in Antiphon, *χρή* beats *δεῖ* in Lysias, *δεῖ* beats *χρή* in Isokrates. Synonyms, one will say. Oh yes! But *δεῖ* occurs only once in Homer. *δεῖ* must have been at one time dead prosaic.

Isokrates was an epideictic orator, Isokrates was a great teacher. No wonder that *ἐπιδείκνυμι* pushes *ἀποδείκνυμι* to the wall as *ἐπιδείξῃς* pushes *ἀποδείξῃς*. The proportion is different in Antiphon, is different in Lysias, but there are various readings and sharp synonymical distinctions are not to be expected in the oratorical sphere, where effectiveness is the main thing, and the two 'demonstrations' run into each other. Plato himself is not so particular as he might be, and we must not press the point. Nor must we point to the significance of the rare use of the passive of *διδάσκω* as the sign of the teacher. Isokrates believed in the paramount importance of nature, and he knew that learning was not a passive process, though *μάθος* comes through *πάθος*. *μανθάνω* is the other side of *διδάσκω*. But if Isokrates uses the passive but once, Antiphon, in a much smaller compass, it is true, uses it but once, and Lysias only in the disputed Epitaphios. We are on common Greek ground. So we are on common Greek ground when it comes to the expression of the adversative relation. One would expect a teacher to be more explicit. But no! 'The language is sometimes kind enough to give warning by *καίπερ* and *δμως*, but often no notice is given and failure to understand is charged to stupidity'. There are very few *καίπερ*'s in Isokrates, more *δμως*'s, but for that matter there is no *καίπερ* at all in Antiphon, there are few in Lysias, but it is well worth noticing that the rhetorical *καίτοι* flourishes in Isokrates, seemingly out of proportion. *καίτοι* in the question, which abounds in him, gives liveliness or pseudo-liveliness. The varying use of the preposition is a favorite field of observation, but as I have said before, except in flagrant instances, the differences do not make themselves felt. There is no *ἀμφί*, no *ἀνά* in Isokrates, nor for that matter in Antiphon or Lysias. The absence of *σύν* from Isokrates, discovered by Haupt before Tycho Mommsen, is not more remarkable than the scarcity of it in Antiphon and Lysias. All three are shy of *πρός* c. gen., the use of which is phraseological mainly, and Isokrates' love of *πρός* with acc. does not reveal itself by a glance at the index. *παρά* 'on the part of' c. gen. belongs to the oratorical apparatus. *περί* c. dat. does not occur in Lysias at all. In Antiphon it occurs with a verb of risking, an old idiomatic use. In one of the Isokratean letters, we find *ἀ περί*

τοῖς σώμασι ἔχουσι <γυναῖκες>. If the passage is genuine, we doubtless have to thank Plathane or Lagiske for it. The department is stronger than the *χαρακτήρ*, stronger than the individual. The orators are more like each other than any one else, and there is something after all in the vilipended Hegelian triads of Greek literature (A. J. P. XXIV 231, XXV 105). To discuss Isokrates at all and say nothing about the hiatus would be manifestly improper, and so I will wind up these observations, if observations they may be called, by the remark that in Isokrates the hiatus-breeders (*ἐκ*) *τρόπου* and *τρόπῳ* yield supremacy to *τρόπον*. There is but one *τρόπον* in Antiphon and that not adverbial, and in Lysias (*ἐκ*) *τρόπου* and *τρόπῳ* dominate. This will not surprise the attentive readers of the Journal, but the statistics given A. J. P. XV 521 have been supplanted by the fuller account of Helbing, *Der Instrumentalis bei Herodot*, p. 18. Helbing does not seem to have known anything about his predecessor Spencer, nor would he in any case have concerned himself about Cis-Atlantic work any more than Sturm concerned himself about my studies in *πρίν* (A. J. P. IV 89) or Fuchs about my work in *ἔως* (A. J. P. XXIV 388). But that is the mischief with all statistical work. *Truditor dies die novaeque pergunt interire lunae*. It is a pity that *novi lunatici* can not be made to fit the verse and rejoice the heart of the anti-statistician.

Such indexes as Preuss's help to make up for the loss of ancient treatises on *ἡ ἐκλογή τῶν ὀνομάτων* (Dionys. Halic. de Comp. Verb. c. 1) and enable us to sharpen our sense of the differences of diction among the orators. To be sure, these differences are evident on the surface, and we say without hesitation that Isokrates is timid and conventional, that Lysias is reserved, that Demosthenes plunges his fingers deep into the thesaurus of the language, as we can see by comparing the three in the same sphere, the sphere of the Attic rowdy, Lys. III, Isokr. XX, Dem. LIV, but the impression would be made more distinct by a detailed comparison with the vocabulary of the comic stage, and if any trouble should arise in the study of the same famous Dem. LIV, I should be tempted to seek refuge in Aristophanes. The scene of LIV is Aristophanic. We are consorting with *ἰθύφαλλοι* and *αὐτολήκυθοι*, and our feet are in the mire of the Athenian streets. Cf. Vesp. 259 with D. LIV 8. In § 39 we are told of the feats of the *Τριβαλλοί*, and their own language is used in the telling. We are told among other things how they 'devour' the *ἑκαταία*. Cf. Ran. 366. This impious proceeding has many Biblical and even modern analogies, but what of the text? The best MSS have *κατακαίειν*, a corruption for which we find in inferior authorities *κατεσθίειν*, clearly a gloss on the original word, whatever that was, in spite of the ingenious system of permutations and combinations, by which Professor Sandys has elicited *κατα-*

καίειν from an original κατεσθίειν. Schaefer suggested κατακάπτειν, a word *bonae notae*, says he, which has not found its way into the dictionaries. καταπίνειν is not bad, but there is another word that is still nearer κατακαίειν, and that is καταπαίειν. Standing in the aforesaid mire, I hear the Acharnian say to his pigs in a poke, Ach. 834: ὃ χοιρίδια πειρήσθε κᾶνις τοῦ πατρὸς παίειν ἐφ' ἄλῃ τὰν μᾶδδαν, αἴκα τις διδῶ. Here παίειν means ἐσθίειν (Hesych.), like κόπτειν, like σποδεῖν, like φλᾶν. See the commentators on Ar. Pax 1306. In the mouth of these precious Mohocks of antiquity, καταπαίειν might well have been used for κατεσθίειν. καταπαίειν is to κατεσθίειν as 'gobble' to 'devour'. The change from π to κ is very slight, and will remind every good American of the change of 'c' to 'g' in the show-bill of the Franco-American bar, where 'sherry cobblers' appear as 'sherry gobblers'.

In an address delivered some years ago at the University of Chicago, I pleaded the cause of the specialist, and of course, the cause of the specialist in Greek syntax. 'To him who knows the foliage and the branchage of every tree', I said, 'the wood is no mere smudge of green and to him who knows the finer articulation of language, the groves of Academe are something more than a row of broomsticks. The vocabulary may furnish the colors that enliven the long procession. It cannot give the gesture of the hand, the flash of the eye, the gleam of the set teeth, the stoop of the figure that unties the knot, the stately swaying, the hurrying step, the deliberate gait, all that is revealed by the kinematoscope of that syntactical study which has recently fallen under the ban of educational authority on this side and that of the Atlantic'. All this is deplorably tropical and I will not undertake here to justify the details of the procession. But I am disposed to stick by the procession itself. According to a reviewer in the *Neue Philologische Rundschau*, 1903, p. 555, the well-known writer Mauthner has said 'Für die eigentlichen Zwecke der Sprache ist die Syntax der Parademarsch im Vergleich zur Felddienstübung oder zur kriegerischen Aktion eines Heeres'. The figure is not a mere figure. It is in my judgment a very effective protest against much that is done in the name of psychological syntax to-day. Now, I am not an enemy of psychological syntax. The trouble is that psychology does not go far enough back. As Mauthner says, a battle is not a procession, and any one who has seen a battle knows that it is not in the least like a procession. When we write, the order of our words is not necessarily the order of thought. When we speak, we speak largely in phrases that have been ordered for us, that we have caught from our earliest childhood. Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings we can gather perfectly normal conditional sentences. It is in vain that we seek illustrations,

as some scholars do, in the writings of untutored newspaper men. The untutored newspaper man is often under the domination of Cicero, Plato, Isokrates. WUNDERLICH in his *Umgangssprache* draws on Sudermann. But that is about as fair as Plato was in the Phaedrus, if indeed that 'new Archilochos' had the hardihood to manufacture a Lysianic speech and then criticize it as if it were by Lysias. An imitation of *Umgangssprache* is after all not *Umgangssprache*.

C. J.: For nearly a generation Professor NÖLDEKE'S *Kurzgefasste Grammatik* has maintained its place as the standard grammar of Syriac and an indispensable hand-book for all students of Semitic philology. An English translation of this important work has long been needed, and within recent years, with the remarkable growth of Semitic studies, the need has become more and more apparent. The present translation, prepared from the second German edition, (Dr. JAMES A. CRICHTON, London, Williams and Norgate), is in all respects a faithful reproduction of the original and has the merit, not altogether common in works of this character, of being written in good idiomatic English. It is evident that the translator is thoroughly in sympathy with his subject, and he admirably reflects Professor NÖLDEKE'S luminous style. While no attempt has been made to alter the substance or the arrangement of the grammar, the translation contains some improvements upon the German original. The citations have been verified, a number of minor errors have been corrected, and facility of reference has been greatly increased by the marginal addition, throughout the work, of the items of the table of contents. An index of the passages cited, which is wanting in the original, has been drawn up and placed at the end of the volume. The typography of the book is excellent, and its general appearance most attractive. Dr. CRICHTON'S excellent translation will certainly be welcomed by Semitic scholars both in England and in America.

H. L. W.: Every student of Classical Philology knows how soon many of his books are out of date and how quickly they must be replaced by later editions on account of the constant increase in material and the progress of knowledge. The teacher of Latin Epigraphy has felt this condition very keenly of late and is correspondingly glad to welcome the supplement to M. RENÉ CAGNAT'S excellent *Cours d'Épigraphie Latine*, of which the third edition appeared more than six years ago (Paris, Fontemoing, 1904, pp. 473-505). In these pages the author, besides making additions and corrections of more or less consequence throughout the book, has considerably enlarged the bibliography, giving brief analyses of important articles, has improved the

chronological list of the Roman emperors, especially by a more accurate and detailed dating of the imperial salutations, has made three pages of additions to the list of signs and abbreviations and has added a new index to the whole volume.

Ungracious as it may seem to find any fault with a book which in three editions has been of such value to students and is on the whole so admirable, we may yet point out defects which really detract from the usefulness of the work. In the first place the bibliographical lists, even as now supplemented, are far from complete for the most recent and most important books. For example, we should expect to find such titles as H. Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, II, pars 1, 1902; G. N. Olcott, *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Epigraphicae*, I, fasc. 1, Rome, 1904; F. Buecheler, *Carmina Epigraphica* (pp. xxiv f.); W. Schulze, *zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*, Berlin, 1904 (p. 37); G. Greeven, *die Siglen D M auf altchristlichen Grabschriften*, Erlangen, 1897 (p. 253). It is a matter for regret, too, that the student is not referred to recent discussions of the *carmen Arvale* by Birt, Goidanich, and Stowasser and that a place was not found for the treatises on the language of the inscriptions by Kübler, Neumann, Pirson, Carnoy, Church, and others. The dearth of illustrative material is a still more serious defect from the point of view of the American student, who now must have Cagnat in the one hand and Dessau in the other. It would have been easy in publishing this supplement to add two or three hundred well-chosen inscriptions for the use of beginners and many will regret that M. Cagnat has not seen fit to do so. In this respect the Introduction of Professor Egbert is far superior for the class-room and in its second edition, which is expected to appear within a few months, will doubtless be more widely used than ever, at least on this side of the Atlantic.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 11 E. 17th St., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Aeschylus. Prometheus; with introd., notes and critical appendix by J. E. Harry. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1905. 358 pp. 1 il. 12°, cl., \$1.50.

Gordis (W. S.) The estimates of moral values expressed in Cicero's letters: a study of motives professed or approved. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1905. 102 pp. 8°, pap., 75 c. net.

Hussey (G. B.) A handbook of Latin homonyms. Boston, *B. H. Sanborn & Co.*, 1905. 179 pp. 12°, cl., \$1.50.

Kirk (J. W. C.) A grammar of the Somali language. New York, *Macmillan*, 1905. 10 + 216 pp. 8°, cl., \$2.25 net.

Nutting (H. C.) Studies in the si-clause: 1, Concessive si-clauses in Plautus; 2, Subjunctive protasis with indicative apodosis in Plautus. Berkeley, Cal., *University Press*, 1905. 35-94 pp. 4°, pap., 60 c.

Pearson (H. C.) Essentials of Latin for beginners. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1905. 316 pp. 12°, cl., 90 c.

FRENCH.

Cousin (Georgius). De urbibus quarum nominibus vocabulum πόλις finem faciebat. Thesis. (302 S.) Nancy, *Berger-Levrault et C^o*, 1904. 8°. 8 fr.

Chabot (J.-B.) Chronique de Michel le Syrien, patriarche Jacobite d'Antioche, texte syriaque et trad. T. III, fasc. 1. *E. Leroux*. 4°. 12 fr. 50.

Halévy (J.) Les prétendus mots sumériens empruntés en assyrien. *E. Leroux*. 8°. 3 fr. 50.

Mallon (A.) Grammaire copte. 1 vol. *P. Geuthner*. 8°. 9 fr.

GERMAN.

Alciphronis Rhetoris epistolarum libri IV. Ed. M. A. Schepers. (xxvi, 225 S. m. 2 Taf.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1905. m. 3.20.

Apulei opera quae supersunt. Vol. II. Fasc. I. Apulei Platonici Ma-daurensis pro se de magia liber (Apologia). Recensuit Rud. Helm. (ii, 120 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1905. m. 2.40.

Aristophanis Ecclesiazusae. Cum prolegomenis et commentariis ed. J. van Leeuwen, J. F. (xxii, 160 S.) Lex 8°. Leiden, *A. W. Sijthoff*, 1905. m. 5.

Augustini, Sancti Aurelii, episcopi, de civitate Dei libri XXII. Tertium recognovit B. Dombart. Vol. II. Lib. XIV-XXII. (xvi, 635 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1905. m. 4.80.

Bernays (Ulr.) Studien zu Dionysius Periegetes. (73 S.) 8°. Heidelberg, *C. Winter, Verl.*, 1905. m. 2.

Biese (Alfr.) Römische Elegiker (Catull, Tibull, Propert, Ovid), in Auswahl f. den Schulgebrauch hrsg. 2., verb. u. verm. Aufl. (108 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*. Wien, *F. Tempsky*, 1905. m. 1.20.

Commentationes philologiae, in honorem Iohannis Paulson scripserunt cultores et amici. (215 S. m. 1 Taf.) Lex. 8°. Gothenburg, *Wettergren & Kerber*, 1905. m. 4.50.

Donati (Aeli), quod fertur commentum Terenti. Accedunt Eugraphi commentum et scholia Bembina. Recensuit Paul. Wessner. Vol. II. (viii, 550 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1905. m. 12.

Geiger (Wilh.) Dīpavaṃsa u. Mahāvaṃsa u. die geschichtliche Überlieferung in Ceylon. (viii, 146 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *A. Deichert, Nachf.*, 1905. m. 4.50.

Herondae mimiambi. Novis fragmentis auctos quartum ed. Otto Crusius. Ed. minor. (v, 132 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1905. m. 2.40.

Jäger (Osk.) Homer u. Horaz im Gymnasial-Unterricht. (iii, 211 S.) 8°. München, *C. H. Beck*, 1905. m. 5.

Landau (Wilh.) Beiträge zur Altertumskunde des Orients. IV. Eine Inschrift aus Heldua. Tammūz. Tanit pnê-ba'al. Eine Gemme. Worterklärungen. (48 S. m. 4 Taf.) 8°. Leipzig, *E. Pfeiffer*, 1905. m. 3.

Livi (T.), ab urbe condita libri. Ed. Ant. Zingerle. Pars VII. Fasc. IIII. Liber XXXXIII. Ed. maior. (viii, 69 S.) 8°. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1904. m. 1.50.

Mendes da Costa (M. B.) Index etymologicus dictionis Homericae. (xvi S. u. 594 Sp.) Lex. 8°. Leyden, *A. W. Sijthoff*, 1905. m. 10.

Merguet (H.) Handlexikon zu Cicero. (In 4 Heften.) 1. Heft. (iv u. S. 1-200.) Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *Dieterich*, 1905. m. 6.

Persii Flacci (A.), saturarum liber. Recensuit Santi Consoli. Ed. minor. (30 S.) 8°. Rom, *Loescher & Co.*, 1905. m. 80.

Philologiae novitates. Bibliographie neuer Erscheingn. aller Länder aus der Sprachwissenschaft u. deren Grenzgebieten. 1. Jahrg. März, 1905-Febr., 1906. 12 Nrn. (Nr. 1. 32 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *O. Ficker*. m. 1.50.

Polybii historiae. Editionem a Ludov. Dindorfio curatam retractavit Theod. Büttner-Wobst. Ed. altera. Vol. I. (1, 361 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1905. m. 4.40.

Procopii Caesariensis opera omnia. Recognovit Jacob. Haury. Opus ab academia regia Bavarica praemio Zographico ornatum. Vol. I et II. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1905. m. 24.

Rabenhorst (Max). Quellenstudien zur naturalis historia des Plinius. 1. Tl. Die Zeitangaben varron. u. capitolin. Aera in der naturalis historia. Diss. (71 S.) 8°. Berlin *E. Ebering*, 1905. m. 2.40.

Schmidt (Max C. P.) Altphilologische Beiträge. 2. Heft. Terminologische Studien. (x, 91 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *Dürr'sche Buchh.*, 1905. m. 1.40.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Argive Heraeum. By Charles Waldstein, with the coöperation of G. H. Chase, H. F. De Cou, T. W. Heermance, J. C. Hoppin, A. M. Lythgoe, R. Norton, R. B. Richardson, E. L. Tilton, H. S. Washington, J. R. Wheeler. Vol. II. Boston and New York, *Houghton, Mifflin & Co.*, 1905.

Ashmore (S. G.) *The Classics and Modern Training*. New York, *G. P. Putnam & Sons*, 1905.

Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Scienze Storiche. (Rome, 1-9. Aprile, 1903.) Vol. II. Atti della Sezione I: Storia Antica e Filologia Classica. Roma, *Ermanno Loescher*, 1905. 12 fr.

Cicero's Cato Maior. Erkl. v. O. Drenckhahn. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1905.

Cobb (William Henry). *A Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Metres*. An Elementary Treatise. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1905.

Curme (Geo. O.) *A Grammar of the German Language*. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1905. \$3.50.

Demosthenes on the Crown. (For the Use of Schools.) Ed. by W. W. Goodwin. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1905. (Reprinted.) (Smaller edition.)

Dennison (Walter). *A New Head of the Scipio Type*. Reprint from A. J. of Archaeology. Second Series. Vol. IX (1905). No. 1.

German American Annals. Continuation of the Americana Germanica. A Monthly devoted to the Historical, Literary, Linguistic, Educational and Commercial Relations of England and Germany. New Series. Vol. 3. No. 5.

Gordis (W. S.) *The Estimates of Moral Values Expressed in Cicero's Letters*. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*. Chicago, 1905. 75 c.

Guerlac (O. G.) *Selections from Standard French Authors*. Boston, *Ginn & Co.* 50 c.

Hermes. Zeitschrift für classische Philologie. Herausg. v. Fr. Leo u. Carl Robert. XL. Band. 2. Heft. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1905.

Jones (Thomas Madison). *Case Constructions of Similis and its Compounds*. (J. H. U. Diss., 1903).

Latin Exercise Book. Caesar's Gallic War. Book I, II, III, IV. New York, *University Publishing Co.*, 1905.

Livi (Tit) ab urbe condita. Libri I, XXI, XXII. Edited with introduction, commentary and index by Emory B. Lease. (Gildersleeve-Lodge Latin Series.) New York, *University Publishing Co.*, 1905.

Macdonnell (A. A.) *The Brhad-Devatā attributed to Śaunaka*. Part. I. Introduction and Text and Appendices. Part II. Translation and Notes. (Harvard Oriental Series. Edited by A. R. Lanman. Vols. V and VI.) Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University, 1904, @ \$1.50.

Mahaffy (J. P.) *The Progress of Hellenism in Alexander's Empire*. Chicago, *The University of Chicago Press*, 1905.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Literatur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. J. Ilberg u. B. Gerth. Achter Jahrg. XV. u. XVI. Bandes 3. u. 4. Heft. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1905.

Neuphilologische Mitteilungen. Herausg. vom Neuphilologischen Verein in Helsingfors. Nr. 1/2, 1905.

O'Connor (C. J.) The Graecostasis of the Roman Forum and its vicinity. U. of Wisconsin Ph. D. Diss. (University Bulletin, No. 99.) Madison, Wisc., 1904. 25 c.

Ochsenbein (W.) Die Aufnahme Lord Byrons in Deutschland u. sein Einfluss auf den jungen Heine. (Untersuchungen zur neueren Sprach- u. Literaturgeschichte. Hrsg. v. O. F. Walzel.) 6. Heft. Bern, *A. Francke*, 1905. 3 m.

Oxford English Dictionary. Ed. by J. A. H. Murray. REE-REIGN (Vol. VIII) by W. A. Craigie. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*. April 1, 1905. 60 c.

Peterson (Principal William). The Unity of Learning.

Petronii Saturae et liber Priapeorum. Quartum ed. Franciscus Buecheler. Adiectae sunt Varronis et Senecae Saturae similesque reliquiae. Berolini, *Apud Weidmannos*, MDCCCIV. 3 m.

Plessis (Frédéric). Poésie latine. Textes choisis et commentaire. (Collection 'Minerva'.) Paris, *Albert Fontemoing*, 1905.

Rasi (Pietro). Nascita di Lucilio. Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Scienze Storiche. Estratto dal vol. II.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Herausg. von F. Buecheler, H. Usener, A. Brinkmann. N. F. LX 2. Frankfurt a./M., *Sauerländer*, 1905.

Schuchardt (Hugo). An Karl Mussafia, Graz. Im Frühjahr, 1905.

West (Andrew F.) True and False Standards of Graduate Work.

Zielinski (T.) Bacchylides. Separatabdr. aus *Eos*. V 25-38. Lemberg, 1899.